

THE *Nation*

LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 152

NEW YORK · SATURDAY · MAY 17, 1941

NUMBER 20

IN THIS ISSUE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS

569

EDITORIALS

Is Inflation Here?

571

No Henbane for Japan?

572

ARTICLES

Stalin Gets a New Job *by Louis Fischer*

573

The Cost of Knudsenism *by I. F. Stone*

575

The St. Lawrence Bottleneck *by Bryant Putney*

577

Anti-Semitism in Exile *by William Zukerman*

579

German Strategy: 1914 and 1941 *by Alfred Vagts*

581

Everybody's Business *by Keith Hutchison*

584

In the Wind

585

A Native at Large *by Jonathan Daniels*

586

BOOKS AND THE ARTS

A Poem from France *by Justin O'Brien*

587

Notes on a Spring Journey *by Margaret Marshall*

587

The National Gallery *by Christopher Lazare*

588

A New Wave of Old Tyranny *by Rustem Vambery*

589

Holmes and Pollock *by Thomas Reed Powell*

589

Irvin Cobb's World *by George Joel*

590

e e cummingsesq *by Babette Deutsch*

591

Art: Architecture of the TVA *by Douglas Haskell*

592

Records *by B. H. Haggin*

593

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

594

Editor and Publisher

FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor
ROBERT BENDINER

Washington Editor
I. F. STONE

Literary Editor
MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors

KEITH HUTCHISON MAXWELL S. STEWART

Dramatic Critic

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager and Director of Circulation

HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager

MARY HOWARD ELLISON

The Shape of Things

THE ARRIVAL OF RUDOLF HESS IN SCOTLAND by parachute provides the perfect opening for the most fascinating mystery story of the war. How it will unfold is still a secret. But already the radio commentators and editorial writers are busy searching for clues. Raymond Gram Swing has offered four possible theories to explain Britain's fantastic visitor: first, that he is indeed demented, as Berlin insists; second, that he flew to Scotland on a secret peace mission for Hitler, a mission that was revealed only through his accidental injury; third, that he went as representative of an anti-Hitler cabal, to offer peace against Hitler's wishes; fourth, that his flight was an escape. Mr. Swing seems to incline, very tentatively, to explanation number two, which is perhaps the most sensational of the lot. If it is the correct one, we may never know it, for Hitler will as a matter of course continue to repudiate his unsuccessful emissary, and Hess may never tell the facts. Perhaps this will be a mystery story without a last chapter. But the most generally accepted theory is the most obvious—that Hess is a deserter and traitor who fled to save his skin and is presumably prepared to "tell all." If this plot is the real one, his visit may be of untold value to Britain. But in many ways it is harder to believe than the more fantastic explanations. Hess's chief characteristic has been his unquestioning party and personal loyalty. He was the Nazi *sans reproche*, if such a term can be applied to murderers and terrorists. He never questioned why or sought personal power. He is the last man on earth who might have been expected to betray Hitler—but that, after all, is in the best mystery-story tradition.

★

IN THE BRIGHT MAY MOONLIGHT BRITAIN and the Nazis have been trading heavy blows. For several weeks the German bombers have been concentrating on British ports, where there have been heavy casualties and a massive destruction of homes. How much damage has also been done to port facilities and shipbuilding yards is naturally a military secret. Inevitably these raids must cause economic dislocation, but there is no evidence that they have seriously interrupted the rhythm of indus-

Published weekly and copyright, 1941, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Washington Bureau: 856 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. Entered as second-class matter, December 13, 1879, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

trial production or that they have shaken morale. The great attack on London on the night of May 10, in the course of which some of the capital's most beautiful ancient buildings were battered, has been advertised by the Nazis themselves as "a revenge raid." This is a new and open avowal of terror tactics. Britain's war effort will not be reduced by the razing of Westminster Abbey, nor will Parliament cease to be effective even though its historic chamber is gutted. But such vandalism may well increase the British demand for reprisals. British raids on Germany during the past week have been directed mainly at the industries and shipyards of Hamburg and Bremen and at the railroad centers and steel and chemical plants of the Rhineland. Attacks on Berlin have been only on a minor scale, perhaps designed chiefly to appease British opinion. In the other raids, however, large forces have been employed, and the fury of German reactions suggests that the new high-explosive bombs hit many important targets. The offensive power of the R. A. F. seems definitely on the upgrade.

★

THE NEAR EAST STILL SEEMS LIKELY TO BE the theater of the next German offensive, but Balkan conquests have first to be consolidated and various diplomatic and military preparations completed. Greece, apparently, is being wooed with kind words, but the Serbs are being subjected to the same kind of ruthless ferocity that the Poles have experienced. In the western desert temporary stalemate continues under the blazing fury of the African sun. The British still hold Tobruk strongly and by so doing discourage any further advance by the Axis forces at Sollum. In Iraq, Rashid Ali's small air force has been broken and his troops forced to retreat at several key points. Reports indicate that he has failed to gain the support either of his own countrymen or of other Arab nations. He has yet to receive any military backing from the Axis, and it now seems that his hand was forced by the arrival of British troops at Basra before the Germans and Italians were ready to send aid. There have been reports of demands made on General Dentz, Vichy's commander in Syria, to allow German forces to occupy certain strategic bases and airfields. Probably these are premature, for it seems likely that Syria is one of the chief matters under discussion in the negotiations between Admiral Darlan and the Nazis. A preliminary agreement has been reached easing slightly the barriers between unoccupied and occupied France, and discussions are going forward with a view to reducing payments for the army of occupation by 25 per cent—which will still leave Germany a handsome profit to devote to the buying up of French industry. What the quid pro quo is to be has yet to be disclosed. Since Syria is a mandated territory and not a colony, its control might be relinquished without breaking the letter of Pétain's pledges.

ISOLATIONISTS, RETREATING UNDER FIRE of a public opinion awakening to realities, are wavering between two contradictory arguments. On the one hand they rely on the Lindbergh thesis that since Britain is done for anyhow, help will be wasted; on the other they claim that the urgency of the Atlantic shipping situation is being exaggerated. Raising the question of convoys again, Senator Vandenberg quoted a letter from Admiral Land, chairman of the Maritime Commission, which said: "Between January 1 and April 30, 1941, 158 vessels of 781,914 gross tons were reported sunk in all parts of the world (according to our composite records, which we believe to be complete). Of these 158 vessels only 12, of 66,782 gross tons, cleared from United States ports." Following challenges from London, Admiral Land explained that his letter had been misconstrued. The figures given, he said were those of "sinkings reported by the press and other public sources of information. There is reason to believe that actual losses run substantially greater than reported losses." Statistics since released by the British Admiralty show that the difference between losses chronicled by Land's office and actual sinkings is indeed substantial. The April total was 488,124 tons, which, added to the revised figures of losses for the first quarter of the year, produces an aggregate for the past four months of over 1,600,000 tons. Another point to be noticed is that sinkings of ships actually carrying American goods are not the whole problem. The heaviest losses, it is said, occur on the east-west passage, and thus any attempt to measure the extent of the shipping crisis must take into account the accumulation of goods waiting in American ports for ships which fail to arrive.

★

GENERAL FRANCO'S LITTLE PURGE IN THE Spanish army and police and in the Ministry of the Interior has aroused widespread speculation. The friction which always existed between the old army officers and the Phalangists has undoubtedly been intensified by the misery of the country and the imminent possibility of invasion. The showdown has resulted in a shift in the balance of power in favor of the army, and Franco has been able to shove into key positions several men in whom he has personal confidence. But it would be reckless to conclude from these changes that Spain is preparing to free itself from Axis control and resist the threatened Nazi thrust toward Gibraltar. The newly installed officials are men whose opposition to the Phalanx implies no corresponding love for the democracies. General Carlos Asensio, the new Chief of Staff, is an able officer and an old friend of Franco's. He is also an extreme reactionary. Lieutenant General Alfredo Kindelas, who has been put in charge of Catalonia, was transferred from a similar post in the Balearics, which have never emerged from under the military control of Mussolini.

The changes in Spain probably have much the same significance as had the ousting of Laval and the appointment of Darlan in France. Hopeful commentators who looked then for a "firm" attitude toward Hitler forgot that the controlling factor in the situation was the military dominance of Germany. In the case of Franco, it is well to remember that there are 100,000 Nazi soldiers, officials, technicians, and Gestapo agents in Spain today.

✱

INSPIRED STORIES ARE BEGINNING TO APPEAR in the Japanese press regarding the desirability of liquidating the "China incident." It is admitted for the first time that China's vast size makes its conquest prohibitively expensive if not altogether impossible. The all-important matter of "face" is taken care of by the insistence that the Japanese troops could easily defeat the Chinese if they could catch them and by renewed denunciations of American interference. Just how seriously this surprising maneuver should be taken, it is difficult to say. With American aid increasing and Soviet supplies still being delivered, there seems little likelihood that Chiang Kai-shek can be tricked into accepting anything short of complete restitution of Chinese sovereignty. And there is no indication that Japan's desire for peace has reached such an advanced stage. Articles in Japanese newspapers hint at the possibility of a withdrawal from some of the occupied sections of China in the hope that the remainder may be more easily pacified. Such a move would only dramatize the confusion of Japanese policy. It is apparent that the Japanese militarists are caught in a web of their own making. An embargo on oil would be the most effective way of making certain that they remain enmeshed.

✱

WE BELIEVE THAT THE ADMINISTRATION has acted wisely in rounding up Germans and Italians charged with overstaying their leaves in this country. No doubt some of these men are not convinced Nazis and Fascists, but the control exercised by the totalitarian powers over their nationals makes it necessary to regard all Germans who are not outspokenly opposed to Hitler and Mussolini as potentially subversive. We hope that if these men cannot be returned to Europe some method will be found to keep them out of harm's way. Manfred Zapp and Günther Tonn, of the Trans-Ocean News Agency, who have been rearrested and held for deportation, are in a different category. They have openly been carrying on Nazi propaganda but, it is charged, have not registered with the State Department as foreign agents. Their activities have frequently been exposed in *The Nation* and elsewhere, and it is high time their wings were permanently clipped. But even these men, though far more important than the sailors, are comparatively

small fry. It is well known that the real centers of Nazi propaganda and espionage in this country are the embassy and the consulates. And their most dangerous underlings are more likely to be found on Park Avenue than in the back streets of Yorkville.

✱

TAX PROPOSALS PRESENTED TO CONGRESS last week by Leon Henderson and Marriner S. Eccles are better in most respects than the Treasury proposals on which we commented two weeks ago. They would eliminate the proposed excise levies on telephone bills, matches, candy, and chewing gum, but would impose much higher taxes on automobiles and other durable consumers' goods, the production of which competes with the defense program. This seems to us eminently sound in principle. The production of automobiles should be cut down far more than the 20 per cent now contemplated. In order to achieve this a tax of 50 or even 100 per cent on new cars would be justified. The Henderson-Eccles proposals also call for much higher excess-profits taxes and substantially higher gift and inheritance levies than are included in the Treasury plan. They would provide for a more moderate increase in the income and surtax rates on personal incomes in the lower brackets but would offset this, in part, by reducing the exemption for dependents. The tax on moderate incomes would be slightly higher than that proposed by the Congressional Committee, and the tax on large incomes would be substantially higher than under either of the previous plans.

Is Inflation Here?

DESPITE the Administration's efforts at price control, the commodity markets during the past few weeks have exhibited all the earmarks of the early stages of inflation. Moody's sensitive index of commodity prices rose more than 2 per cent in the week ending May 10, making a total increase since the outbreak of war of 37 per cent, half of which has been recorded since mid-February. To some extent prices of imported raw materials, which are not so easily subjected to control are responsible for this movement. But the greatest price increases in recent weeks have not been in imported commodities but in domestic farm products. Cotton rose from \$11.81 a bale on May 3 to \$12.42 on May 10. Wheat jumped from 94 to 96 cents a bushel, and corn rose nearly 4 cents a bushel in the same period.

This rapid increase in farm prices cannot be explained by rising demand or fear of short crops. Estimates of the 1941 winter wheat crop just released by the Department of Agriculture give it as 653,000,000 bushels, compared with last year's crop of 589,000,000 bushels.

This indicates a carry-over to next year of 515,000,000 bushels as compared with this year's record 390,000,000.

Crop prospects in general are excellent. The sole cause of the increased prices, therefore, seems to be speculation stimulated by the probable passage of the Fulmer bill, which would require that crop loans be made at 85 per cent of parity. An 85 per cent loan rate would guarantee farmers approximately \$1.15 a bushel for wheat, 87 cents a bushel for corn, and 16 cents a pound for cotton, as compared with 83 cents a bushel for wheat, 75 cents a bushel for corn, and 12 cents a pound for cotton under existing legislation. It is estimated that enactment of the proposal would raise consumer prices for meat, dairy products, eggs, and poultry from 10 to 20 per cent above the present high levels.

Such an increase, it need hardly be pointed out, would raise havoc with the entire price-stabilization effort. It would certainly justify renewed demands for higher wages, and increased wages mean higher industrial costs, which in turn would lead to higher prices. No price administrator, regardless of his ability, can be expected to be successful if an important price sector is taken out of his hands and left at the mercies of Congress.

The situation provides a first-rate challenge to the President. If he is wholly sincere in his determination to prevent an inflationary price rise such as occurred in the last war, he will have to act quickly and decisively. This will not be easy. Nothing contains more political dynamite than a farm-subsidy bill. The difference between the House, which proposed a 75 per cent loan rate, and the Senate, which raised the ante to 85 per cent, have just been "compromised" by agreement on the higher figure. As an important matter of principle, either the bill should be defeated or the loan rate should be struck from it altogether; the loan rate should be left, as in the past, in the hands of the Department of Agriculture. It is an important matter of principle because it is evident that if price stabilization is to succeed, the fixing of prices must be taken wholly out of politics and intrusted to an administrative agency which has full power to act.

But why, it may be asked, should the farmer be singled out to bear the brunt of price stabilization? Workers have already received substantial wage increases; business profits are running far ahead of normal; why should not the farmer enjoy some of the benefits of prosperity? The answer is that the farmer is already obtaining the benefits of the war boom quite as much as the industrial worker and is likely to continue to profit from increased consumer buying. On April 15 the Department of Agriculture estimated that purchasing power of farm products had increased more than 10 per cent in the last year. This makes no allowance for the exceptionally sharp increase in farm prices which has occurred since that date. Reflecting the rise in farm purchasing power, sales of mail-order houses and farm-equipment manufacturers are

from 20 to 50 per cent above their sales of a year ago.

Solicitude for the farmer, then, hardly justifies the wrecking of our price-stabilization machinery. The last war demonstrated that in the long run the farmer was the chief sufferer from a runaway inflation.

No Henbane for Japan?

THE President announced on May 10 that he had approved the recommendation of Brigadier General Russell L. Maxwell, administrator of export control, and had issued a proclamation placing eight additional articles under the export-licensing system. The articles are hyoscyamus (henbane), stramonium, columbium, tantalum, cryolite, fluorspar, chemical wood pulps, and digitalis seeds. Perhaps these materials are not less important for being little known. But this meticulous addition of obscure items to the list of articles for which an export license is required seems a little ludicrous beside the continued export to Japan of huge quantities of so important a war material as oil. The latest report of the Department of Commerce shows that our shipments of petroleum to Japan in March were 1,500,000 barrels, as compared with 1,280,000 barrels in February and 1,491,000 in January. These huge exports were in no way hindered by the necessity of obtaining licenses for them from General Maxwell, although when oil was put on the export license list last summer it was assumed this would be a virtual embargo. It has turned out instead to be a meaningless sop to sentiment for an oil embargo, and we continue to provide fuel for the Japanese navy and air force. And there is good reason to believe that Japan is not the only beneficiary of our willingness to let the oil companies, like our copper and steel magnates, make a profit on the sale of the materials of war to our enemies.

Few newspapers printed anything about the resolution introduced by Senator Gillette of Iowa and Congressman Coffee of Washington for a joint investigation into trade with the Axis powers in basic war materials. Too much money is involved here, and more courage is required than the average politician possesses. There are three possible channels through which the Axis may obtain supplies from this country. One is through Soviet purchases which would be later transferred to Germany. The trickle to which our trade with Russia has been reduced is sufficient evidence that this is not a major source of supply. The second, of course, requires no investigation. Our huge exports to Japan have been largely in war materials and machine tools. That some of this may be transshipped to Europe is indicated by the State Department's announcement that it has revoked all licenses for the shipment of scrap rubber to Japan and occupied parts of China, a belated move, like all the State Department's

actions of this kind. For a rubber shortage here is already in sight. Washington correspondents were given to understand "off the record" that this move was designed to check one German source of supply—which would indicate that in some materials at least transshipments have been made from the Far East to Europe. There was a similar hint in the statement of Hugh Dalton, Minister of Economic Warfare, in London on April 25. Dalton said a shortage of ferrous alloys was developing in Germany and that negotiations were on in Washington to curb "supplies to enemy countries." Has Germany been obtaining American ferrous alloys, through Japan or Spain? For Spain is the third intermediary through which war materials may be reaching the Axis.

Senator Gillette, in introducing the joint resolution for an inquiry, referred to the testimony of Joseph Curran, head of the National Maritime Union, that Standard Oil was delivering oil to Spain's Canary Islands for transshipment to Germany and Italy. E. B. Lyman, publicity director of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, explained afterward to a representative of the Federated Press that "first of all, you must understand we are an international company—that is, Standard Oil of New Jersey is a holding company with subsidiaries

in many countries. We must keep an international viewpoint. As a private company we cannot declare our own boycott. As a general principle we sell to anyone that wants to buy and can pay for it until the State Department places an embargo on any country."

We believe that the Senate and House should not only pass the Gillette-Coffee resolution but should instruct the joint committee to inquire what oil, copper, steel, and other materials made by American companies or their subsidiaries in Latin America, the Near East, and the Dutch East Indies are reaching the Axis. British-American oil companies in the Dutch East Indies have just renewed their sales agreement boosting oil exports to Japan from 494,000 to 1,800,000 tons a year. We should like to know how much oil Japan has been getting from American oil companies in the Near East. J. H. Carmichael, the oil expert of the *New York Times*, reported last July 28 that earlier in the year Japanese oil interests had purchased 1,000,000 barrels of oil from the Anglo-Iranian Company, a majority of whose stock is owned by the British government. These British sales have been one of the principal arguments used by our oil companies against an embargo on sales of American oil to Japan. Both ought to be shut off.

Stalin Gets a New Job

BY LOUIS FISCHER

MOLOTOV has been purged. Stalin is Prime Minister in Molotov's place. Of late, too, Molotov has taken a back seat as Foreign Commissar—witness Stalin's direct conduct of the negotiations that led to the Soviet-Japanese pact in April. The trouble started soon after Molotov returned from Berlin late last year. In February V. G. Dekanozov, Soviet ambassador to Germany, became a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. That made him second to Molotov in the Soviet foreign service and thus a menace to Molotov. Simultaneously Paulina Zhemchuzhina, Molotov's wife, was demoted. Writing in *The Nation* of March 1, 1941, I said: "Either she is no longer Madame Molotov or this is a faint hint to Molotov that the purge may get him too." Apparently she is Madame Molotov.

Nobody in Russia has security. The next-to-the-highest and the lowest can always be purged. No Soviet citizen may enjoy personal authority or popularity, and Molotov has lately been too prominent. Stalin has no fear of Molotov. But Stalin is the kind of man who does not like to have around him even vaguely potential rivals.

The reasons for Stalin's self-appointment as Premier

are psychological as well as political. Stalin has always aspired to be Premier. Before the removal of Rykov from that post in December, 1930, foreign correspondents in Moscow had definite information that Stalin would succeed him. Important Bolshevik leaders told me this, and I believe a tentative decision had been reached. But it was later revoked because of opposition. Stalin, it was argued, was not a Russian. Moreover, he was not yet omnipotent. Though he was crushing the right-wing Rykov-Bukharin-Tomsky opposition, it still lived, and Stalin did not wish to give it a weapon with which to beat him: it might have tried to rouse Russian nationalist sentiment against him if he had taken the premiership. (When Lenin died, his natural successor would have been Leo Kamenev, then in league with Stalin, a member of the dominant triumvirate and vice-premier under Lenin. He was not selected because he was a Jew. Instead, Rykov, the Great Russian, got the job.)

Stalin's highest personal goal has been to destroy the Lenin-Trotsky couplet created by history and to substitute a Lenin-Stalin or Stalin-Lenin couplet. This desire runs through all his acts. It would require him to have not merely Lenin's supreme power but also Lenin's

supreme titles. Titles count to an "Asiatic." He was thwarted in 1930. But since then Stalin has demonstrated his Great Russianism better than most Russians. He has recently restored nearly all of czarist Russia's boundaries, and he has fostered Russian nationalism. The elevation of this Georgian to the post of Premier, therefore, will not shock the peasants and the Russian patriots today as it might have eleven years ago. At that time, moreover, some citizens might have said, "Who is this man?" or, "Stalin is usurping power." Now they can only comment that he has been the boss anyway; why shouldn't he have the title as well?

Stalin is sixty-two. If his life's ambition has been to wear Lenin's official mantle, this is the time to achieve it. Another circumstance intensified the urge. The Communist Party has become a rubber stamp. It has been merged with and submerged by the Soviet government. Stalin is leader of the party. That is now an empty distinction. So Stalin wanted to head the government. A Soviet crisis may intervene any day. Hitler may attack Russia, or he may subject Moscow to humiliating pressure which would prove the bankruptcy of Soviet diplomacy since Litvinov's dismissal. In such an event, Stalin would like to have in his hands not only all the reins of power but also the reins of office. Stalin is a supremely jealous man; anybody who has been near men in high positions knows how jealous they can be.

Moscow is jittery. Stalin anticipates decisions and developments of critical importance. For the entire strategy of the war has been changing. The *New York Times* of April 10 reported this statement by the Moscow *Red Star*, daily newspaper of the Red Army: "There can be no question of an invasion of Britain. The central burden of the war has been transferred from the west to the east." The Soviet-Nazi pact of August 23, 1939, and the subsequent "friendship" were made possible by Hitler's concentration on the war in the west. Stalin could rob in the east because Hitler was busy in the west. But if the plan for the invasion of England has been abandoned, the basis of the "good-neighbor" relationship between Russia and Germany is gone. I do not know whether the invasion of England is off. But the *Red Star* would not say so unless the most exalted residents of the Kremlin thought it; and if Stalin believes that "the burden of the war has been transferred from the west to the east"—and the heavy German troop concentrations on the Soviet frontier in March and April support the view—then Moscow has good reason to be worried.

Germany has an army of four million men, four million men all dressed up with few places to go; and they could go into Russia. The German army is stronger than the Soviet army. These circumstances will in future govern Stalin's policy. I never thought Soviet foreign policy "enigmatic" or opaque. But today certainly the situation is very clear. It is no longer a question of

what Stalin will do. The question is: What will Hitler do to Stalin? Will he strike? Will he exact more economic aid and military collaboration?

These are the fruits of Soviet appeasement. When Chamberlain and Daladier appeased the fascists, Moscow railed, and preached that appeasement led to war and subjugation. Moscow was right. French appeasement led to the fall of France. British appeasement brought bombs on London, Liverpool, and Plymouth. Then Moscow took the path of appeasement. Its Munich was dated August 23, 1939. Appeasement always results first in peace and later in war or in ignominious defeat without war. Hitler is about to feed Stalin all the bitter apples of appeasement. Indeed, the feeding has already started: (1) the Soviet-Japanese treaty dictated by Hitler in the hope that it would encourage Japan to move south toward the Dutch East Indies and Singapore; (2) the withdrawal of diplomatic privileges from the envoys in Moscow of Nazi-occupied Belgium, Norway, and Yugoslavia (Why did Moscow not do this to the Norwegian envoy in May, 1940, and to the Belgian envoy in June, 1940); (3) Moscow's prompt recognition of the anti-British rebel of Bagdad.

Moscow is in a German vise. From the Arctic Ocean and Finland down to the delta of the Danube, the Black Sea, and now the islands commanding the vital Dardanelles, Nazi armed forces have encircled Soviet territory and Soviet waters. There is but one possible relief—to divert the German army away from Russia. For a moment, in a frantic attempt to engineer such a diversion, Stalin encouraged the Yugoslavs to fight and reprimanded Hungary for being anti-Yugoslav. But that effort failed; indeed, it helped precipitate the present acute state of German-Russian relations. If Hitler were to push into Africa through Spain or concentrate on Asia Minor, Moscow would breathe more easily, and if Hitler needed a road through Turkey for any such enterprise, Stalin would bless the move—if Hitler should ask him.

But I believe that no matter what campaigns the Reichswehr launches—unless it crosses the Channel to seize the British Isles—it will have sufficient reserve strength to command Stalin's obedience. Did Molotov point with dissatisfaction to the unfortunate results of Soviet-Nazi "friendship"? Did he evince coldness for the further Soviet sacrifices which this "friendship" may yet—and soon—demand? Perhaps he had a few doubts. Stalin has no doubts. Having weakened the regime and the army by the purges, which went much farther than most people realize, and having thus created many silent enemies, his personal position depends on peace, even at the cost of surrender to Hitler. To remain dictator he must remain an appeaser. By an iron logic Stalin attains the apex of individual power at the very moment when the Soviet regime is called upon to pay the highest price of appeasement.

The Cost of Knudsenism

BY I. F. STONE

Washington, May 11

A GOVERNMENT that cannot organize its own country for production cannot organize the world for freedom. So long as the Knudsens remain at the controls of defense we risk our own humiliation and the contempt of the nations we have encouraged to resist Hitler. Business-as-usual cannot produce arms fast enough.

"How can Britain and America hope to win the war this way?" a Greek asked an American correspondent as the *Panzer* divisions poured in on his country. "On October 28 Roosevelt pledged America's complete aid to Greece, but not a single cartridge has yet arrived from America." In a year's time the defense program has grown from four billions to forty, but headlines are not armament. When the backlogs of aircraft companies are eight times as large as their total production last year, ordinary methods will not deliver. One high army officer told the American Society of Tool Engineers on March 24 that the greatest service it could render defense was to teach manufacturers "to find ways and means of securing production with the tools at hand or the tools now in existence." Our success depends on our ability (1) to divert present productive facilities to arms manufacture, (2) to keep the big companies from monopolizing defense work, and (3) to bring every idle machine into use by subcontracting and "farming out" as much work as possible.

A confidential bulletin of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce says that the automobile industry is our greatest reservoir of machinery for defense production. Knudsen seems to have devoted a large part of his energies to keeping that a secret. Only $3\frac{1}{3}$ per cent of last year's sales by his own company, General Motors, were for defense. In the first quarter of this year the proportion of defense sales rose to—almost 8 per cent. The President says he wants a new super-bomber program to turn out 500 bombers a month, but everyone seems to have forgotten that last October Knudsen and the automobile manufacturers promised us 1,000 bombers a month. They formed an Automotive Committee for Air Defense and announced that the work of manufacturing these bombers would be done "very largely with existing machinery and with little new equipment. Both time and facilities are lacking for development of new machine tools. The job is one of adaptation. . . ." Mr. Roosevelt might ask Knudsen to explain why the Automotive Committee was disbanded, the 1,000-bomber program whit-

tled down to 300 a month, the decision to use existing automotive machinery abandoned. Six months have passed, and Ford and General Motors haven't finished haggling over the terms of the contracts under which new factories will be built to turn out parts for these bombers.

I am reliably informed that in its German factories General Motors is producing aircraft for Hitler. Why can't General Motors produce aircraft in its American factories? The answer, as I showed in a previous article, is that this would interfere with the current boom in automobile production. The proposal for a small-scale test of the Reuther plan was rejected by Knudsen. Knudsen promised weeks ago to supply Reuther with blueprints so he could work out the details of his proposal to manufacture planes in automobile factories, but the promise has yet to be kept. The *American Machinist*, organ of the machine-tool industry, said in its issue of April 2 that the Reuther plan had been "rejected squarely on its essential features—treatment of the automobile industry as one firm with the work parceled out in semi-compulsory fashion and labor participation in management—rather than on the rather irrelevant arguments as to whether the plan could actually produce 500 planes a day." The "irrelevant" is appalling.

Mr. Roosevelt says he wants every machine tool in the country put to work, but his wishes will remain ineffective as long as he depends on the OPM to carry them out. Our smaller factories and idle machines can be brought into production only by widespread "farming out" of orders, but when you farm out an order, you farm out the profit too. The Defense Commission has been issuing publicity on "farming out" since the first of the year—and quietly sabotaging the program all the while. The President's statement itself seems to have been the brain child of Knudsen's publicity office, and was apparently designed to provide a backfire against increasing criticism. The men who want to farm out orders were not consulted before the statement was issued, and it can be taken about as seriously as the State Department's moral lectures to Japan. The lectures do not interfere with shipments of American oil and copper to Japan, and the well-staged warnings of the OPM will not interfere with the backlogs of the big arms makers. By the middle of February the Bethlehem-du Pont group of companies, whence Knudsen himself comes, had 23 per cent of defense orders. Their huge backlogs in part explain why—according to OPM esti-

mates—half the machine tools in this country are in use less than eight hours a day and many are idle. They also help to explain why the National Association of Manufacturers in its recent survey found that only 28 per cent of the country's manufacturing plants had received defense orders.

This contrast between idle machines and swollen backlogs may also provide a clue to the failure of the commission to do the obvious a year ago and order an inventory, industry by industry, of productive capacity. The findings would have raised too many uncomfortable questions, and the answers would have interfered both with business-as-usual and with the defense profits of big business. Such an inventory would have disclosed how many machines in the automobile industry could turn out parts of plants, tanks, and guns and have shown the vast reservoir of machine capacity in our smaller factories and our small towns. It would have led to plans like Reuther's for the automobile industry and Murray's for steel, and it would have demonstrated the need for community pools, a form of democratic organization for defense from which the Knudsens and most of the army and navy bureaucrats recoil. These pools of productive capacity, utilized by Beaverbrook in England, serve to parcel out work and orders to machine shops and firms too small to handle a whole contract by themselves.

Pools of this kind sprang up last fall in some fifty communities which took seriously the talk of bottlenecks and shortages. They found advice and encouragement in Morris Llewellyn Cooke, the famous Philadelphia consulting engineer, long an advocate of scientific management, who managed to find a cranny for himself in Sidney Hillman's division last October—Mr. Knudsen wasn't interested in his ideas. The community pools he helped to organize were given the run around, and he himself was shunted to one side in January just as the movement seemed to be making headway. The big-business crowd under Knudsen and John D. Biggers then took over, with a Kansas City furniture manufacturer as front man. The Navy Department had issued an "order" in January appealing, as the President now does, for wider subcontracting. But the order, like Mr. Roosevelt's statement, was hortatory. It was not implemented by any concrete changes in procurement methods. We need an executive order or a law directing procurement officers to force subcontracting, to take orders away from companies which refuse to subcontract, and to deny certificates of five-year amortization for plant expansion to manufacturers who are not utilizing all subcontract possibilities. The ease with which these certificates are now obtained encourages the manufacturer not to subcontract. Why should he share work and profits with smaller firms when he can get the government to finance a new plant for him?

Most of all we need a bureau under someone like

Cook to compile the information supplied by community pools and provide orders for them. They offer the best way to mobilize the American people for defense. A good example of these pools and their possibilities was provided in Beaver County, Pennsylvania. There local manufacturers, civic agencies, the New Deal housing authority, the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the railroad brotherhoods joined in a model survey of its kind. They counted every idle machine and noted every idle square foot of floor space. They made a study of the products these idle facilities might turn out for defense. Though Beaver County already had several big concerns working at capacity and firms employing 77 per cent of the county's workers had defense orders, the survey uncovered an extraordinary variety of idle productive capacity for armament. Five modern machine-tool plants, with the skilled men to operate them, were working only two days a week. Of the seven plants in the county capable of producing alloy steels and aluminum castings, one was completely idle. One large plant equipped to make shells had been closed down for some years. The Beaver County committee came down here full of enthusiasm, with a handsomely bound brochure itemizing the facilities they had available for defense, ready to take orders through one or two of their larger manufacturers or to incorporate as a community committee and parcel out the work that way. They got nowhere.

I believe the President could find no better method to tap our unused reserves of machines and man-power than by encouraging these community committees. Through them he can reach down to the grass roots and set free the unused capacities in thousands of small business men, labor leaders, local "sparkplugs." They will organize themselves. The secret of the unsuspected energy put forth in great emergencies and in the great upheavals of history, such as the French Revolution, is that the hidden abilities of thousands of unknown men and women break through the crust of bureaucracy, monopoly, and habit. Must we wait for graver danger to shake the Knudsens loose and call forth this wide participation of the American people in the defense effort? Or can the President by wise leadership evoke it now? Much is to be gained by it—new ideas in defense production, the morale that comes from tasks to be performed, the habit of cooperation among ordinarily hostile elements. A democratic mobilization on a basis like Beaver County's would do more than speed defense; the attitudes developed would ease post-war reconstruction. But the big industrialists understand that a mobilization of this kind is a menace to monopoly. It can never come about as long as they are in charge of defense. They will try to keep "farming out" in their own hands, and as undemocratic as they can. Their background and training make it impossible for them to understand the meaning of a democratic defense or its necessity.

The St. Lawrence Bottleneck

BY BRYANT PUTNEY

FOR the second time since he came to office President Roosevelt has asked Congress to approve the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The original St. Lawrence treaty between Canada and the United States, drawn up during the Hoover Administration, lacked twelve votes of winning the necessary two-thirds' majority when it came before the United States Senate in 1934. The course of events at home and abroad during the last seven years has made it clear, Mr. Roosevelt believes, that "the opposition which defeated the St. Lawrence treaty in 1934 was a mistaken opposition based on failure to appraise the full needs of the country in the world situation which was even then developing." Nevertheless, the same coalition of sectional and industrial interests which killed the project during the early days of the New Deal is seeking to block it again. The railroads, the power companies, and the coal-mining interests have launched a campaign to convince the American people that the proposal is a grandiose leaf-raking project which ought to be speedily squashed so that the country can turn its attention to more urgent matters.

Actually, completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence development would give enormous impetus to our own and Canada's defense projects by helping to overcome bottlenecks in transportation, electric-power production, and shipbuilding. It would strengthen our whole national economy and make possible the expansion of production and consumption upon which the survival of democracy depends.

If through rail traffic between Salt Lake City, say, and New York were obstructed by a hundred miles of narrow-gauge track just west of Chicago, only a lunatic would object to a plan to link the eastern and western sections by a standard-gauge track. What is proposed in the St. Lawrence agreement is not very different. To open the Great Lakes to deep-draft ocean shipping we need only build a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie, dredge a few feet of earth out of the channels and canals linking Lakes Huron, Erie, and Ontario, and improve the international section of the St. Lawrence between Lake Ontario and Montreal. The succession of short fourteen-foot canals which Canada has already built to circumvent the rapids in this part of the river must be deepened, and longer locks must be built. The waterway so constructed would have a minimum depth of twenty-seven feet—sufficient to accommodate 71 per cent of the world's merchant fleet. It would provide a 2,400-mile passage from Du-

luth, Minnesota, to the Atlantic, and 95 per cent of this distance would be open water.

Included in the agreement is a plan to develop hydroelectric power by harnessing the flow of the St. Lawrence River. A main navigation and power dam would be built across the St. Lawrence at Massena, New York, and a small control dam farther up the river. One power house would be built at Massena, on the American side, and another at Cornwall, Ontario, on the Canadian side. The 2,200,000 horse-power developed at the dam would be divided equally between the two countries. At Niagara Falls, 200 miles farther south, existing hydroelectric facilities would be improved to yield an additional 787,000 horse-power, and erosion-control works would be installed to preserve the scenic beauty of the falls. Plans of the New York State Power Authority call for the integration of the St. Lawrence and the Niagara developments in a transmission network capable of carrying about 670,000 horse-power as far as New York City.

The cost of the project to the federal government would be about \$166,000,000. Under a federal-state agreement expected to be announced shortly at Washington, New York State would be given control of the generation and distribution of electric power and would pay \$90,000,000 for the necessary construction in the Massena area. This cost would eventually be liquidated through the sale of power. Canada would pay for the construction of the canals on the St. Lawrence between Massena and Montreal.

The proposed seaway, to be completed in four years, would add about 10,000,000 tons to the annual freight-carrying capacity of the United States and about 6,000,000 tons to that of Canada. Even under normal conditions this new transport capacity would be absorbed by the needs of a growing population. With the United States embarking on the largest production program the world has ever known, and with the railroads almost wholly unprepared for any substantial increase in traffic, the new capacity will be urgently needed in 1945 to relieve the worst transportation shortage in our history. If the railroads tried to haul 10,000,000 additional tons of freight, they would have to order a large number of new locomotives and freight cars from companies which are now converting their plants to the production of tanks, gun carriages, and other armament.

Construction of the deep waterway can be expected to reduce transportation costs throughout the Great Lakes tributary area. The railroads now charge 95 cents to carry

100 pounds of oranges from Lake Wales, Florida, to Chicago. The haul from Lake Wales to Boston is 160 miles longer, but because the roads must compete with coastal shipping lines they charge only 80 cents for the same load. Extension of coastal, intercoastal, and trans-ocean shipping services to Great Lakes ports like Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and Milwaukee would give the Middle West equal transportation advantages with the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific seaboard.

The 120-mile stretch of shallow water in the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Ogdensburg, New York, is one of the major bottlenecks in our naval and merchant shipbuilding program. If the canals which bypass the rapids in this section were twenty-seven instead of fourteen feet deep, and if the locks were 600 instead of 260 feet long, the extensive shipbuilding facilities on the Great Lakes—now either standing idle or operating part time as repair yards for lake steamers—could be utilized for the construction of the cruisers, destroyers, and ocean freighters needed to win the Battle of the Atlantic. Use of Great Lakes shipyards need not wait on completion of the waterway. Once the project is approved, production schedules of lake yards can be dovetailed into those of our ocean yards in such a way as to speed up our shipbuilding program by two or three years. If we began building the seaway this year, the new canals in the St. Lawrence would be ready for use by the time the craft laid down now in Great Lakes yards were completed. According to Navy Department schedules some of our cruisers and destroyers will not be delivered until 1947 and 1948. The use of Great Lakes yards would permit the construction of many of these vessels by 1945.

Yards and ways suitable for the construction of from twenty-five to thirty ships of cruiser size are now available, or could be made so within a few months, on the American shores of the Lakes. About a dozen ways of similar size are available in Canadian yards. In addition, there are facilities on both sides of the Lakes for building large numbers of destroyers, escort vessels, and other types of naval craft, as well as merchant ships. If cruiser construction were transferred to the Great Lakes, seacoast yards could build the urgently needed cargo ships, which can be put together at the rate of three or four a year. Shifting thirty cruisers from salt-water to fresh-water yards would enable us to build three or four hundred additional freighters in the next four years.

Great Lakes yards at the present time could handle perhaps \$1,000,000,000 worth of building; naval contracts so far awarded to these yards—for construction of a few submarines, sub-chasers, and other small craft—total \$115,000,000. At a time when the safety of the democratic world depends in large degree upon our speed in moving new vessels off the ways, it is tragic irony that the lack of a deep-water outlet to the sea prevents us from utilizing more than 10 per cent of the potential

capacity of one of the greatest shipbuilding regions in the world.

Expansion of electro-process industries producing vital defense materials on both sides of the border in the St. Lawrence region is now being thwarted by lack of power. Two of the five aluminum plants in the United States are located in this region—one at Niagara Falls, the other at Massena. Both are now importing power from Canada, and these imports may be cut off within a few months because of Canada's expanding needs. Plants of Union Carbon and Carbide, the Vanadium Corporation, and other companies producing ferro-alloys, chemicals, aniline dyes, and abrasives in the Buffalo-Niagara area are likewise compelled to buy Canadian power. The Federal Power Commission estimates that by 1945, when St. Lawrence power could be made available, the shortage of capacity in up-state New York, with allowances made for additions already scheduled by private companies, will approximate 500,000 kilowatts. Since this estimate makes no provision for the expansion of aluminum production at Massena or Niagara, it should be considered highly conservative.

A St. Lawrence survey made recently by the Department of Commerce revealed that the failure of New York State to develop its water-power resources in recent years, and its dependence upon the more expensive steam-power generation, has led to a decline in the state's industrial activity while other states have been forging ahead. "It is fairly clear," the report declared, "that New York State will suffer under an increasing competitive disadvantage so long as available sources of cheap hydro power continue to be neglected. In the Buffalo area, where industry has been based on cheap power to a relatively large extent, the threat of stagnation is perhaps even more serious than in the rest of the state." The proposed St. Lawrence-Niagara development promises "a new lease on life to New York State industry, a source of cheap electricity which should make possible the resumption of manufacturing growth."

The cost of electricity to most classes of consumers in New York is higher than the average for the United States, and the cost to some types of users is the highest in the country. The St. Lawrence Survey estimates that the development of public hydroelectric power at Massena and Niagara would reduce the average cost per kilowatt-hour to farm and residential consumers 64 per cent below 1937 rates and the cost to commercial and industrial consumers 25 per cent. According to the New York State Power Authority, the proposed development would bring savings totaling \$26,000,000 a year to all types of consumers.

These figures give a clue to what is behind the opposition of the power and coal companies to the St. Lawrence project. Yet the proposed development does not threaten existing utility investments. Though it would

be one of the largest in the world, the St. Lawrence-Niagara power project would provide less than three-fourths of the additional generating capacity that will be needed in the New York area during the next decade. If this development is not undertaken, privately owned steam plants will have to be built to meet the future need. Apart from the question of national power policy, this would actually slow up our defense effort, since factories producing steam-generating equipment are engaged in meeting the heavy demands of regions not favored with abundant water resources. Under present circumstances, power could be developed by harnessing the St. Lawrence and Niagara rivers more speedily than by building coal-burning plants.

Its opponents assert that as a defense measure the St. Lawrence project is worthless because a minimum of four years would be required for its completion, because men and materials badly needed for other purposes would have to be diverted to its construction, and because, when completed, the seaway and power plants would be highly vulnerable to aerial attack. Not one of these objections is justified. Since our entire shipbuild-

ing program could be speeded up if the construction of cruisers were transferred to fresh-water yards, the benefits of the project would be immediate. In any case to restrict our defense planning to what can be done in the next few months is to invite disaster. The "emergency" will continue longer than that. If this were not true it would be foolish to build a two-ocean navy or a third set of locks at the Panama Canal, neither of which will be completed before 1945.

No real diversion of men and materials would be involved, for the transportation, shipbuilding, and power facilities that would be made available in the Great Lakes basin would otherwise have to be provided elsewhere. Far from slowing up our defense effort, construction of the St. Lawrence project would be a use of our resources to bring maximum results in a minimum of time. As for their vulnerability, St. Lawrence locks and dams would present no more attractive targets to aerial raiders than the navy yards and vital industrial areas along the eastern seaboard. It is difficult to believe that those who raise this bogey against the St. Lawrence project do so in good faith.

Anti-Semitism in Exile

BY WILLIAM ZUKERMAN

NO STORY that has come out of war-torn Europe throws a more macabre light on the ironies of this war than that of the anti-Semitism of the exiled Poles in England—the story of a small group of vain, obstinate Polish reactionaries abusing the hospitality of a liberal people by attempting to revive on English soil the vilest prejudices of pre-war Poland.

Of all the peoples in Europe who have been conquered and enslaved by the Nazis, the Poles have suffered most. The ordeal to which they have been subjected surpasses in barbarism and cruelty anything known before in modern warfare. In some respects the sufferings of the Poles have been greater even than those of the Jews. It was difficult for Germans to look down upon the Jews as an inferior race when the diabolical cleverness and far-reaching power of international Jewry were so harped on by Nazi propagandists. Mingled with the hatred of the individual Nazi for the Jew was inevitably a secret respect, even a degree of fear. But for the Slav the German had an unbounded contempt which could be easily converted into hatred and persecution. The Nazi movement capitalized this feeling for its own purposes. For years the Russian Communists were groomed as the future enemy. Then, at the eleventh hour, the Nazi-Soviet pact brought a sudden violent change. The de-

spised, inferior Russians had to be accepted as friends and allies. The psychological wrench was very great and explains in part the ferocious cruelty with which the Nazis fell upon those other Slavs, the Poles.

Shamelessly and with brutal severity the Nazis have reduced the Poles to a condition of virtual slavery. The system of forced labor which they have introduced in practically every country of occupation has in Poland been supplemented with the mass deportation of nearly a million Polish men and women who are being forced to live and work in Germany under the most horrible conditions. The Nazis seem to take a special delight in humiliating the Poles. Poles are transported to Germany like cattle and are examined in the market-place and selected for labor as if they were actually slaves. Polish families are brutally separated, fathers and children being deliberately sent to different provinces. The Polish slaves are not allowed to live under the same roof with their masters. Any relationship between German women and Polish men is punished with typical Nazi barbarism. German newspapers have carried stories of German women who, with heads shaven and with placards on their breast, were driven through the streets as despised examples of *Rassenschande* simply because they had been caught speaking to a Pole.

In Warsaw and other Polish cities the Nazis have segregated not only the Jews but also the conquered Poles in ghettos. There are streets where Poles are not allowed to walk, cafes and theaters which Poles are not allowed to enter. There are "Jim Crow" street cars for Poles in Poland and "Jim Crow" carriages on Polish railways. Like the Jews, the Poles are often made to wear special badges and armlets to distinguish them from the Germans.

If suffering can ennoble a people, the Poles should have emerged from the past year and a half as a great and purified nation. Of the Poles in Poland this may be true. But Poland is shrouded in silence no less than in oppression, and it is impossible to know all the facts about it. The reaction of the Poles who have left their country, however, can be observed. In London today there are as many as thirteen Polish-language papers. The government-in-exile publishes its own propaganda with the cooperation of the British. It has an army, navy, air force, and parliament. Polish statesmen, journalists, and intellectual leaders have gone to London to join what is probably the largest émigré colony in the world. Its spokesman and leader, General Sikorski, is now in the United States conferring with President Roosevelt and other government officials.

One does not have to look beneath the surface of Polish life in exile to encounter what is probably the most fantastic paradox of the war period: the Poles in London, themselves the victim of hatred, bigotry, and racial discrimination, are permeated with the very spirit that made Poland the shambles that it now is. The temper of these Poles in exile is shot through with hatred of the Jews. Interminable discussions of the Jewish question began almost as soon as the first Polish exiles set foot on English soil and have continued to the present day, as if these children of a nation destroyed had no problem but that of the Jews to solve, as if anti-Semitism were the only thing left of old Poland worth preserving and transplanting to foreign soil.

Even the small remnant of the Polish army which was saved from France after Dunkirk was divided by racial prejudices. All Poles of military age in England were obliged to join the Polish army. Polish Jews who joined were soon made to feel that they were still the inferior race of *Zhidi* that they had been in Poland and were treated with that supercilious haughtiness which is characteristic of the Polish upper class. But having experienced several years of British freedom and equality, these Anglicized Jews could not stand such treatment and openly revolted against the humiliation. Ten Jewish military doctors resigned in a body. Before the matter reached a scandal stage, Premier Sikorski, who is also the commander-in-chief of the Polish army, stepped in and with a few energetic military orders put an end to the discrimination.

But an attitude which could be suppressed by military order in the army could not be eradicated from civil life, and anti-Semitism has persisted among the exiles, particularly among the Polish intellectuals—professors, historians, writers, journalists, civil servants, former members of the Diet, and government officials. Writing under the assumed name of Wengerski, a Polish professor from the University of Cracow well known for his anti-Semitism in former days has published a book, "September, 1939" (issued by the official Polish publishing house in England), asserting that the fall of Poland was

due primarily to the sympathy of the Polish Jews for Germany. Another Polish professor, J. Ditter, has published a book on Poland's "surplus Jewish population"; a large number of Jews, he says, must emigrate from Poland if the Polish people are to thrive.

In the field of journalism the Polish exiles have displayed the same spirit. Of the dozen or more Polish



General Sikorski

papers published in England, practically all except the outspoken Socialist press are more or less permeated with anti-Semitism. The semi-official conservative *Dziennik Polski* and the liberal *Wiadomostki Polskie* voice it only occasionally, but the *Jestem Polakem*, organ of the Polish National Democrats, is brazenly carrying on anti-Jewish Nazi propaganda in the Polish language with all the embellishments of the Nazi racial "philosophy" and Julius Streicher's phraseology. In vain have Jewish groups in Great Britain protested against this propagation of Nazi ideas; in vain have outraged British liberals, headed by the London *News Chronicle*, stormed against this abuse of hospitality and insult to democracy on the part of the Polish exiles. At the time I write the *Jestem Polakem* is still appearing, despite efforts to stop its publication by cutting off its supply of paper, and is proudly proclaiming on British soil the validity of Hitler's racial theories—theories which have resulted in the enslavement also of the Poles.

The climax of this fantastic tragi-comedy was reached at the first session of the Polish National Council, or parliament in exile, which met recently in London. On this occasion the Jewish question was formally discussed in the classic manner of the Sejm in Warsaw. Those who spoke were not irresponsible Polish journalists but former deputies of the Sejm, party leaders like Yushviak,

and Polish statesmen like General Zheligowski, "the hero of Wilno." In effect they declared that after the war Poland would have no place for the Jews, and that the only solution for the whole painful problem was to deport all European Jews to a desert island off the coast of Africa.

In this most inhuman of all wars, greater crimes than this have been committed, and greater outrages against decency and justice have been perpetrated. But somehow nothing is more depressing than these trivial words and acts of a people who have learned nothing from their great ordeal.

German Strategy: 1914 and 1941

BY ALFRED VAGTS

MANY if not most wars are wars refought. This has been seen often enough in Europe: every war between France and Germany in the past hundred years has been called a "war of retribution." From the nature of things it is more often the losers than the winners who wish to repeat the trial of strength. The wonder is that the victorious Allies did not reckon with the strength of the passion for revenge in the humiliated leaders of Germany's defeated army. That war potential was overlooked.

Each side was, indeed, determined to learn something from past experiences. The moral drawn by British conservatives was that there must never be such a war again; thinking that conservatism must be like-minded everywhere, they looked for cooperation from the conservatives of the German army. French military conservatives, though admitting the possibility of a fresh war, were comfortably convinced it would be a repetition of the last, another war of stalemate and attrition; conscious of victory, they did not examine the last conflict critically to find out how to wage a different and better war next time. The conservatives of the German army, however, drew a wholly different conclusion from their defeat: that there must be a new edition of the war, an improved and altered—if necessary, a revolutionized—edition. Looking back with neither repentance nor horror, and certainly not with complacency like the French, they were bitterly determined to extract the last ounce of teaching from every fact they could collect about the First World War.

Perhaps the great difference between this and previous conflicts is that the same men, on the German side, are fighting it who fought the earlier war. Henry Adams in 1913 could say: "There is no such thing as a real consequence in history; the generations are actually separated and unconnected." This time, however, the same generation has suffered defeat and achieved recovery. The generals of today were lieutenants, captains, or, at most, majors in the last war; with their memories reinforced by innumerable historical studies, they have fought over again the battles of the Marne, of Flanders, and of Verdun.

The true "have-nots" in Europe were these German officers, the losers of the last war. It was not Germany itself that lacked resources but the German army, constantly intriguing and finally clamoring for prestige, budgets, soldiers, tanks, and heavy guns, all preconditions for that victory which had escaped them so narrowly, as they pretended, in 1918. It was these officers who to a large extent dictated German historiography about the First World War. A systematic campaign, carried on abroad as well as at home, to remove the war-guilt onus did much to weaken the belief of non-German peoples in the "justness" of the Allied cause in the last war and consequently in the war to come; this was directed by an ex-officer, Alfred von Wegerer, well known in this country though hardly well understood in his function as an *innocentiste*. (How much the present war is concerned with the question of war-guilt is indicated by the fact that the Musée de la Guerre at Vincennes, the headquarters of French studies of the World War, has been "transferred" to Berlin, a rather significant part of the loot brought out of France.)

"FIELD-GRAY SOCIALISM"

While the German officers were thus remaking history, striving to repair the errors they had formerly committed through ignorance of the psychology of other peoples, they were also pondering the best way to master and remodel the German civilian world to overcome those "weaknesses" of morale and material that had proved so fatal. In 1915 and 1916, long before the Nazi Party was founded, younger generals like von Seeckt, who may go down in history as the earliest organizer of the German victories in this war, discussed plans to organize and indoctrinate labor, with the help of social and mass-nationalism, in a labor party "which should remain national." The multiple and successive causation process of such a complex structure as the German National Socialist Party cannot be fully described without mention of these early desires on the part of army and navy officers and the later protection given that party by the Reichswehr. Despite the disgust with Nazi methods occa-

sionally betrayed by conservative officers, such a party was needed by them as perhaps the only means of organizing the masses in the Reich for war, and in particular of organizing the economy for war—that is, of sustaining what in Gestapo language is called *Kriegsschauplatz Innerdeutschland*, or the home front.

The National Socialist Party was the instrument chosen by the army to regiment the nation. It called itself socialist—"field-gray socialism" was said to have a long tradition in Prussia as a socialism freed from Marxism and grounded in the paternalism of the Reich, which in a world of uncertainty promised to take care of everyone within its borders and beyond, wherever Germans lived. As such it was opposed to the "plutocracy" of the Western democracies, which was said to have caused the First World War and to be attacking National Socialism because it feared that the Nazis would dethrone gold; this virulence against plutocracy was in fact an expression of the very old antagonism between the poor Prussian officer and the powers of finance in the Second Reich. When a German publishing house in 1937 brought out a translation of General J. G. Harbord's book on the A. E. F., it took the liberty of inserting a statement that the true causes for America's entry into the war in 1917 were rooted in the financial world. In July of last year a writer in *Deutsche Wehr*, a military weekly published for soldiers, said, "The world revolution kindled by the German *Wehrmacht* will also cure the peoples of the gold delusion and will cut a decisive stroke through all the effects of this gold mania, including those of an institutional character." Such a war economy as National Socialism, the same journal asserted in a later issue, would enable Germany to conquer the "Carthage of the twentieth century," England, and to retaliate for the murder of 762,796 German women and children, whose death, according to the calculations of Professor Shotwell, had been caused by the British hunger blockade.

The socialistic features of National Socialism were not, therefore, "put over" on the army, as so many conservatives abroad believed, unaware that army conservatism in Germany had always been peculiarly hostile to business and finance. Nor was the foreign policy of the Third Reich, the line-up with Russia, displeasing to army circles; in their accounts of the pre-1914 history of Germany the unpardonable error of earlier rulers was said to have been not the naval race with England but the non-renewal of the reinsurance treaty with Russia. This, it was maintained, had led to the fatal "encirclement" of the Second Reich. With increasing violence Germans of the Third Reich denounced this encirclement, which in actual fact was quite as much a self-isolation; in cold military language what they protested against was the dreadful war on two fronts. This was another error which the German fighters had decided not to suffer from again.

BISMARCK'S DREAD

Determination to prevent the repetition of a two-front war, a purely military consideration, was behind the bi-lateral pacts of non-aggression concluded by the future aggressors. Germany's efforts to prevent the formation of an eastern front with the help of Poland in the days of Litvinov's "indivisible peace," with the help of Russia after Rapallo in 1922, and again through the Moscow pact of 1939, had all the one military aim: to avoid what Bismarck dreaded above everything—the *cauchemar des coalitions*, the nightmare of coalitions. This cooperation with powers which had been called the worst names by Germany occasioned many misgivings among the Germans themselves. Hitler's eastern policy seemed highly inconsistent, not in keeping with his anti-Communist rantings. But as a visitor from the Third Reich who understood military matters once said to me: "While we listen to the Führer's speeches and watch Ribbentrop sign treaties, we also do a little lip-reading, and what we read is not the same thing heard by the world. Their lips silently say: Wait, we merely postpone the evil day for the eastern powers. One thing at a time, one artichoke leaf after another; not all at once again, as we did so recklessly after and before 1914, when the Germans thought they could not take on enough enemies and when exuberant soldiers wrote on the sides of box cars, 'War declarations still accepted here!'"

Such restraining influences were particularly called for between 1933 and 1939 as a check on the ambitious German navy. This service had been harder hit by the Versailles treaty even than the 100,000-man Reichswehr; moreover, many army officers during and after the World War held it responsible for having made England and the United States Germany's enemies and for having used funds and man-power that ought to have gone into the making of the additional army corps needed on the Marne in 1914. As a consequence the navy was even earlier and more thoroughly Nazified than the Reichswehr, for with the Stresemann policies continued, its outlook would have remained dark indeed. After visiting a warship in May, 1932, Goebbels wrote in his diaries:

The navy is fabulously in form. All of them, officers and men, are all the way for us. They read the *Völkischer Beobachter* and the *Angriff* [Goebbels's own paper]. From the cruiser Schlesien comes an officer to invite us to dinner. During all that time eager discussion. The lieutenants are fabulous slim fellows, true images of soldierly men. And all are for us. Poor Weimar system! I talk long and answer all questions. The navy is O. K. A few officers in civilian clothes go to the meetings.—"Vom Kaiserhof zur Reichskanzlei."

Despite the eagerness of naval officers, the German navy was to be kept small in order to win British toleration for German rearmament on land and—what tradition-bound Britons did not realize in its full impact—

for armament in the air. The Anglo-German naval treaty of 1935 seemed to the British to indicate that the Germans at last had become much more "reasonable" than in the pre-1914 days, when proposals for naval holidays had been rejected by the Reich Naval Office under Tirpitz. Even though a new Navy League was founded after 1933, in the place of the dissolved *Flottenverein*, to propagandize sea power in the Third Reich, particularly among industrial workers, the navy men, like the colonials agitating for the return of Germany's colonies, were told up to 1939 by the governing powers that they would have to wait. Meanwhile, the building of submarines and aircraft went on without interruption.

German students of the last war were also painfully aware that they or their former superiors had neglected the use or full development of certain potent arms like the tank, an oversight on Ludendorff's part which they found hard to forgive. If they had had tanks during the great spring offensive of 1918 they could have fully and finally separated the French and British armies in northern France. During the offensive of May, 1940, "the fast troops" which were missing in 1918 were on hand to make the deep and fast thrust to the Channel coast (*Deutsche Wehr*, July 17, 1940, in a parallel between the two offensives of March, 1918, and May, 1940). A little less outspokenness prevails about the faultless timing of the great attacks in Poland in September, 1939, and in Norway, where ground conditions helped the aggressor coming with the spring from the south rather than the defenders of Norway's autonomy in the northern part of the country. In each case the meteorological and ground conditions could not have been more favorable to the attacking Germans, who, however, would not praise themselves for this choice because at home and abroad they had declared that these offensives were undertaken solely in order to forestall impending British attacks.

CONQUEST OF PREJUDICE

Defeat drives out at least some prejudices, and it was the determination of the German army leaders that none were to stand in the way when arms or methods tried out by others were to be tested and adopted. For the conservative French and British, parachutists, the "air infantry" or "vertical attackers" originally developed by the Red Army as a military analogy to the revolutionary method of stirring up trouble behind the front of the governing class in a foreign country, possessed too much of the "carrion smell of the revolution" to be acceptable. No such prejudice prevailed on the German side. Nor was "danger" to men and machines a hindrance to the adoption and fullest utilization of dive-bombing methods which had originated elsewhere. Rather did the Stuka methods become the very expression of the fervent desires of the newest and youngest elements in the regen-

erated German army. "You go into a dive a lieutenant," goes a saying in that army, "and you either get hit or come out of it a captain." This meant that no prejudice, no deference to birth or seniority, was to stand, as they had stood so effectively and disastrously during the last World War, in the way of promotion of the fittest. Nothing is more fascinating to those who know the social significance of names in Germany than to see "new names" singled out in the daily communiqués of the German High Command and appearing in droves on the lists of the promoted, while the nobility is cited relatively less often. The highest commanding generals are still those whom Seeckt groomed for the coming war, but the names of the lower-ranking officers indicate that this war is a war of the German petty bourgeoisie, which has never before realized its aspirations as it does now; through National Socialism it partakes of the nationalism of the upper bourgeoisie and the socialism of the proletariat. War, this war, is the way for this hitherto undistinguished class to win distinction for its sons; at the same time the effort stops short of the extreme risk inasmuch as salaries and pensions are guaranteed to the bold.

With this equipment of men and morale, materials and methods, the Schlieffen plan, combined with certain features of Ludendorff's attacking methods, was to be tried over again. What it meant in strategical and tactical terms is at once too obvious and too technically involved for me to describe here. German military writers have done so in articles under significant titles—for example, Schlieffen's Cannae Theory and the War of Our Days (*Deutsche Wehr*, August 23, 1940). In political terms this plan meant that the small neutrals bordering on the Reich were to be treated with even less regard than in 1914. This time there were to be no neutrals, and no German qualms about neutral rights such as the half-hearted Bethmann-Hollweg had admitted in 1914 were to stand in the way of German victory. Besides, the function of these neutrals within the German war economy had changed fundamentally since 1914. Then this economy had relied on the surplus production and imports of these countries; now it wanted the whole of their stocks and of their agricultural and industrial productive power. (What other power had these neutrals?) In the world of neutrals, the feelings of two nations only were to be spared—those of the Soviet Union and the United States.

From the beginning the directors of German rearmament took care not to estrange America. German history professors in Berlin took Ambassador Dodd in hand and tried to make him overlook the sinister rearming that was going on under his nose. *Wissen und Wehr*, a military-science monthly, in March, 1938, expressed the hope that the United States would stick to the decision of 1920 and "take a conscious stand against Versailles and against a universal League of Nations of the Versailles

brand. For what Germany has to say is no message of hatred and discord but—with due recognition obtained for Germany's vital claims, which the Führer has sharply defined and which are not to be renounced or limited—the message of a new order, a message of peace."

As compared with 1914-17, Germany since 1939 has invoked international law much less often and used infinitely less propaganda and sabotage against the United States. This indicates no higher moral standards on its part but rather a determination to use more caution, more self-restraint, to give less provocation for America's entry into the war on the side of Germany's enemies. A repetition of that intervention must by all means be avoided, and in particular an early or timely intervention. A German admiral inspecting the French coast in September, 1938, observed with satisfaction the destruction of Allied war monuments. "The American soldier who landed on the back of an eagle on the beach of St. Nazaire," he wrote, "has lost his sword. No one will repair it" (*Deutsche Wehr*, September 27, 1940). But no one will venture to say again that Americans can never cross the Atlantic in the face of German submarines.

EASTWARD TO CHECK AMERICA

The German war-makers have a great deal of respect for the industrial war potential of the United States; they tried to get the start of it by beginning their own war production well ahead of their M-day. Their "geopolitical" and industrial counterweight against this American might is, in the terms of times gone by, Mitteleuropa and Berlin-to-Bagdad; in the terms of our own day, the thrust toward Suez and through the Balkans, perhaps as far as the Persian Gulf, the firm control of a territory containing enough grain, oil, and metals to make up for German deficiencies. Control of this territory was considered as early as 1916 by generals like von Seeckt to be the most effective way to check America, whose entry into the war was even then expected by the German leaders.

Resumption of the Berlin-to-Bagdad march in the interest of Hitler's New Order for Europe—which is in many ways a copy, only worse, of Napoleon's *nouveau système européen*—is resumption of preparations against American participation in the present war. While they were marching eastward through the Balkans and outflanking Russia, the Germans were largely thinking westward. They are also thinking westward while driving eastward in North Africa, where their control will go far to exclude a possible landing—whether contemplated on this side of the Atlantic or not—of American forces in Africa. These operations serve to bring out that this New Order is essentially anti-American. As such it is by no means new—which is one more reason why Adolf I is also Wilhelm III, *Oberster Kriegsherr* of the second phase of the World War.

Everybody's Business

BY KEITH HUTCHISON

Jesse's Rod

And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse and a branch shall grow out of his roots.—Isaiah XI:1.

SINCE Banker Jones came out of Texas in the dark days of 1932 a thick institutional growth has sprung from the roots of his first planting—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. That tree, in fact, is now merely the oldest and tallest of a grove which includes also the Electric Home and Farm Authority, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the RFC Mortgage Company, the Federal Home Loan Bank, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Disaster Loan Corporation, and the Import-Export Bank. In the past year a vigorous group of saplings have been added—the Metals Reserve Company, the Rubber Reserve Company, the Defense Plant Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, and the Defense Homes Corporation.

This whole arboretum is now designated as the Federal Loan Agency, over which the infatigable Mr. Jones presides as administrator. As such he is the biggest investment banker in the country, and there are few fields of business where his influence has not been felt at one time or another. In the early days of the RFC he shored up many a tottering financial institution, but of late his popularity among his fellow-bankers has waned, for he is a believer in low interest rates and able to back his beliefs by actions.

Last year, as the defense program began to get under way, the banks claimed that if they were to help finance plant expansion the law must be amended so that government contracts could be assigned as security. Congress was impressed by the argument, and the necessary legislation went through. Bankers talked cheerfully of making loans, which would be amortized by government payments in the course of five years, on a 3 or 3½ per cent basis. But at this point Jesse's rod descended on their backs. The RFC, he announced, would be willing to arrange five-year loans at 1½ per cent interest in cases where the credit was extended on the basis of a "definite agreement for reimbursement" by the War Department or the Navy Department. This move damped the bankers' hopes of combining handsome profits with negligible risks and led to some bitter comments in the financial press. But as Mr. Jones wrote in a subsequent letter to P. D. Houston, president of the American Bankers' Association: "1½ per cent interest is a high rate for a government-guaranteed obligation with an average maturity of two and one-half years, and if the War and Navy contracts are not good, banks should not rely upon them as a basis, whatever the interest rates." That was straight professional talk from one banker to another, with no comeback possible.

Mr. Jones again had an impregnable case in the recent controversy over the state of Arkansas's \$136 million bond refunding. A nation-wide syndicate headed by the Chase National Bank, Kuhn, Loeb and Company, and the Mercantile Commerce Bank and Trust Company of St. Louis had

been expected to make a bid for \$90 million of the issue, the remainder to be taken by the RFC on the same terms. However, as the day for calling the existing bonds approached, the bankers seemed uncertain whether they could take up the whole of their share, and they indicated that the interest rate would have to be $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Mr. Jones considered this out of line with the yields obtainable on comparable issues and therefore took over the whole amount at an average of slightly less than 3.2 per cent. A howl against unfair government competition rose from the disappointed bankers, and the *Wall Street Journal* accused the RFC of risking the taxpayers' money in order to give Arkansas a cheap rate. But within a month Mr. Jones was able to announce that the whole \$90 million worth of bonds had been resold at a premium to various dealers and investment houses, including many of the original syndicate members. This implied plainly that the rate previously suggested by the bankers was higher than necessary to secure the distribution of these securities.

The latest move by the RFC to safeguard borrowers against unjustified interest rates is in the utilities field. During a press conference on April 30 Mr. Jones expressed approval of the Securities and Exchange Commission's new competitive-bidding rule and said that the RFC might submit bids in cases where the issues were too large for the bankers to handle; so as to insure "decent rates" for the borrowers. "We are perfectly willing," he went on, "to cooperate with investment bankers, not with a view to competing, but with a view to making funds available at low interest rates." It seems likely that this hint of steel beneath the velvet glove will not be lost on the financial district. With the RFC standing in the background ready to finance good risks on reasonable terms, efforts to defeat the SEC ruling either by collusive bidding or concerted refusals to bid at all are no longer practicable.

Meanwhile at least one branch of the financial community appears eager to appease Mr. Jones. The New York Stock Exchange, after long cogitations over the choice of a successor to "Bill" Martin, now in the army, has offered the post of paid president to Emil Schram, chairman of the RFC, who has been associated with Jesse Jones for seven years. Mr. Schram has not been regarded as one of the left-wing New Dealers, but he is a liberal with a rural background and as such should be able to freshen the atmosphere of Wall Street with a good western breeze. Originally a land-drainage expert, he will now have to tackle, among other problems, the removal of stagnant water in the brokerage business.

Whether he will be able to boost the Exchange's volume of business is another matter. At present Wall Street is definitely in bad shape. Few brokerage firms are able to make money so long as the daily average turnover is only a few hundred thousand shares. To some extent, at least, the trouble is due to a deep-seated lack of public confidence which dates back to the orgies of the twenties. That is a matter which Mr. Schram may be able to help remedy, provided he is given a free hand. But if he has been picked as a man willing to use his Washington connections to "fix" the SEC and other government agencies, the Stock Exchange is likely to suffer another disillusionment.

In the Wind

W. LEE O'DANIEL, the singing governor of Texas, sponsored an "anti-violence" bill to prevent strikes which has passed both houses of the legislature. On April 4 he addressed a letter to a Boston industrialist urging consideration of Texas as a manufacturing locale on the basis of its restrictions on labor. Quotations from the governor's letter follow: "I think some of these wild-eyed labor-leader agitators . . . will think twice before they come to Texas to start their foolishness. We are not taking away from labor the right to strike. They can strike all they want and go fishing; but when they strike and quit their jobs we have plenty of other men in Texas. Anyone who . . . tries to prevent these men from working at the job which he has just quit will find himself picking cotton on one of our prison farms."

ANTI-SEMITISM, according to a recent report by a group of Negro ministers and teachers in Harlem, is again becoming an issue in the New York Negro community. The Christian Front has carried its campaign to Harlem, and a new anti-Semitic leader is rapidly being built up by the pro-fascists. He is Charles Reed, who organizes picket lines around Jewish-owned stores and who works under the slogan "Hitler took from the Jews what belonged to the Germans; let us take from the Jews what belongs to Negroes."

JOHN MALONE, a financial writer on the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, was recently discharged for a "flagrant violation of *Bulletin* news policy." The "flagrant violation" was this lead on a story: "Last week should have been an opportune time for retail-store employees in this area to approach their bosses for a raise. The reason: business was good."

ELEVEN MEMBERS of the New York Newspaper Guild will soon be brought to trial for criticizing an action of the city's Guild leaders. The eleven are members of the press unit of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; in a letter to the secretary of the local they criticized the Guild leaders for precipitating the strike against the Jewish Day. Although the letter was not published anywhere, the Guild's executive committee regarded it as tantamount to strike-breaking. The I. L. G. W. U. unit claims that the letter was merely an exercise of intra-union freedom of expression and that it is being tried for lèse majesté.

IN ITS ISSUE of April 21 Father Coughlin's *Social Justice* gave its views on anti-Semitism. Semitism, it said, "in its tertiary, or third meaning, . . . is defined as 'Jewish politics or Jewish influence in the state or in society.' In [this] meaning *Social Justice* is definitely 'anti-Semitic'—and always will be—because we abhor Jewish influences in politics, Jewish influences in the state, and Jewish influences in society."

[The \$5 prize for the best item received in April goes to Milton Koblitz of Baltimore for his story about the German Jew and the Nazi policeman published on April 26.—EDITORS THE NATION.]

A Native at Large

BY JONATHAN DANIELS

Soldiers' Saturday Nights

THE office of Bascom Johnson in the big new Federal Security Building in Washington looks a long way from the honky-tonks, the juke houses, the tourist cabins, and the dimly lighted trailers around the camps where the soldiers of a whole nation spend their Saturday nights. But he has taken on in defense a job he handled once before in another war, and handled well. He is dealing with a problem he has tracked around the world.

The problem of dealing with the oldest profession is not new to him. He needs luck in it, however; but so also—even if it seems strange to say it—do the girls, the bad girls of the hot places where now the soldiers are made to seem assailed.

Not everybody in Washington agrees with the official policy, being put into action by Mr. Johnson, of a national mobilization in a sort of national vice raid in all communities close to the camps. Around the corner from his office in the Federal Security Agency another official said of him, "If he put on a stovepipe hat he'd look like the picture of prohibition." That may do him injustice. Other men laughed at a law already halfway through Congress which would make prostitution near a camp a federal crime. There seems to be no end of bawdy jokes possible in connection with his job.

It is always possible to make morality funny even when it is very serious. But immorality in the places where the camps are can be hilarious and still terribly sad. Sad or not, in towns close to the camps, and particularly in adjacent towns just beyond the circle of the m. p.'s, the girls seem to be as determined as Mr. Johnson.

In one Louisiana town, when the community bought a certain piece of land to lease to the army—or sell to it cheap—the leading madam was a subscriber to that community fund, as she has been to all others. As morale officers are learning, lesser ladies than this madam became mobilized before the army did. One general at Fort Bragg told me that some of the scarlet sisters had even learned to put children on the steps of trailers in which they welcomed soldiers as camouflage against the m. p.'s.

But the most frequent disguise is the waitress's uniform. There are enough waitresses in a good many joints to stop waiting on table and become guests when there is demand for their company, as there often is. Wherever they are, the best disguise of all is no disguise at all but

the simple fact that they look the ordinary, tow-headed country girls they are.

Not anything about the situation is a secret. Mr. Johnson knows all about it. Wisely a part of the program to save the soldiers from the consequences of sin goes beyond repression of the girls, and recreation and education for the men in uniform, to consideration of the problems of the prostitutes themselves—or girls who might become prostitutes. This does not mean trying to make good girls out of bad girls in any revival-meeting fashion. It does mean some attempt in the camp communities to deal with their welfare problems. Unfortunately, the welfare problems which hurry girls at the pace of the hottest nickelodeon music into the old trade in a big market of womenless men are not limited to the camp towns.

It is almost possible to trace the prevalence of prostitution and the incidence of syphilis up from the poverty of the Mexican border, through the deep South, to the safer, richer North. The prostitution around the camps where it is worst in the United States is the familiar prostitution of all lands where birth rates are high and incomes low. In Mississippi there once was a saying that the most whores came from Smith County. It might have been true: it was a poor piney-woods county, and its Sullivan's Hollow was the Mississippi phrase for the bottom of Mississippi.

Defense officials concerned with the safety of soldiers cannot, of course, solve all the problems connected with the prostitution they are going to "repress." Nobody can do that quickly. But the "waitresses" deserve some attention from welfare workers in places where they come from as well as from those around the camps. The federal wages-and-hours law specifically exempts their employers from paying them even minimum wages. They have to eat. Maybe they prefer to eat to the sound of "Bounce Me, Brother, with a Solid Four." Or they may be the naturally bad girls of a naturally bad land to which hundreds of thousands of the good boys of better places have been sent.

I am as much interested as Mr. Johnson is in protecting the boys from the girls. But without wishing for any relaxation of protection for the boys, I am for the girls, too. No generals are guarding them. No wide land regards their welfare as a part of its security. But the mobilization of a nation has brought them to national attention as a disturbing aspect of this democracy we defend.

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

A Poem from France

TEN days ago a letter from a French friend in the unoccupied region mentioned, among other things, that he was sending "under separate cover a poem that is circulating widely among us here. Read it first," he added, "in the normal way; then fold it along the crease in the middle and read each half separately." On May 7 the poem arrived by air mail, typed on a single sheet of paper with no identification as to sender. The envelope had not been opened. Here are the verses with a literal translation, which unfortunately loses the double rhyme:

L'AME DE LA COLLABORATION PAR P. LAVAL

Aidons et admirons	le chancelier Hitler
L'Eternelle Angleterre	est indigne de vivre
Maudissons, écrasons	le peuple d'outremer
Le Nazi sur la terre	sera seul à survivre
Soyons donc le soutien	du Führer allemand
Des pays navigateurs	finira l'odyssée
A eux seuls appartient	un juste châtiment
La palme du vainqueur	attend la croix gammée

THE SOUL OF COLLABORATION BY P. LAVAL

Let's help and admire	Chancellor Hitler
Eternal England	is unworthy of living
Let's curse and crush	the race beyond the sea
The Nazis on this earth	will alone survive
Then let us be the aids	of the German Führer
Of the sea-going race	the Odyssey will end
To them alone belongs	a just punishment
The victor's glory	awaits the swastika.

The lines testify not only to the state of mind of the French but also to their age-old ingenuity. In the fourth chapter of "Zadig" Voltaire tells us how his hero tore up his tablet and threw the pieces into a rose bush after writing a poem to a lady. An envious courtier, finding one half of the poem, which seemed to contain an insult for the king, had Zadig and his friends imprisoned. They were released when the remainder of the tablet was found.

The spirit of Voltaire still walks the French earth.

JUSTIN O'BRIEN

Notes on a Spring Journey

THE PROCEEDS from Garden Week in Virginia this year went to Bundles for Britain. And spring itself seemed driven by emergency. It came suddenly and very early; production was speeded up, fruit blossoms fell more quickly than usual. I heard they were making paper apple blossoms for the festival in Winchester because the real ones had already faded. Tulips and iris, which should bloom tandem, flowered together. One's mind slipped easily into the pathetic fallacy, the feeling that spring was working overtime lest it be wiped out before the fruits were formed. And the sense of bombs falling in Europe hung like a precarious haze over the whole

green, incredibly beautiful landscape from Washington to Williamsburg to Charlottesville, over the Skyline to Gettysburg and the dogwood grove at Valley Forge.

WASHINGTON IN THE SPRING. The way to Garden Week led through Washington, where the sun of defense is hot. Bottlenecks and bureaucracy seem to bloom faster than anything else in the kitchen garden of democracy; priorities have been slow; and too little planting is being done for the winter of post-defense. But there are promising shoots as well. The refusal to let Big Steel go into a price-and-profit spiral is one. The growing talk of union-company, not company-union, cooperation is another. The fact that most of this talk is going on in labor and left New Deal circles is not as discouraging as it might seem; for one cannot help feeling that labor is more powerful, having coped successfully with big industry, including Ford, and more intelligent, having studied Hitler and survived the Stalinist measles, than it has ever been. Labor, especially C. I. O. labor, has grown greatly in social awareness in the past few years; the days of pure and simple trade unionism are numbered. Labor knows its strength and its facts. It knows, for instance, that the defense program has been slowed not by strikes but by industry clinging to its patents and its profits, its privileges and differentials. Not even that nervous old lady the *New York Times* can give it a sense of guilt. The miners' delegation that walked so jauntily into Senator Truman's coal hearings knew that the real hitch was the determination of the "so-called Southern operators" (as O'Neill of the Northern operators called them) and the Southern Senators (who really looked like Art Young's Southern Senators) to preserve the principle of the differential, though in this case the Guffey Act has reduced the amount at issue to something like three cents on a ton of coal.

I spent a few minutes with Philip Murray and came away feeling that the difference between the archaic Bible oratory of John L. Lewis and Murray's quiet, reassuring, Scotch-burred speech was the difference between the revivalism necessary to organize the mass-production industries and the efficiency and social shrewdness now essential to keep the C. I. O. a going concern. With labor facing its greatest crisis, it was good to hear a lawyer for the C. I. O. speaking of the social future, both at home and abroad, in the same realistic, specific, and militant terms as he might have used in discussing a strike for better working conditions.

The dollar-a-year men describe themselves in this war as WOC (Without Compensation). . . . On the lower corner of a government building appears the neat notation, Bidders Entrance. . . . The current Washington quip is that defense is the OPM of the people.

EARLY AMERICA. Williamsburg, the colonial capital of Virginia, is well on the way to becoming an Early American Coney Island. The sleepy old town I saw some years ago has been practically demolished and its streets are overrun

with tourists and horseless carriages. Not only have the public buildings of the eighteenth century been rebuilt, but some 177 private buildings have been torn down to make way for more restoration; and even the A. & P. now displays its wares in bowed colonial windows. It gets to be a little thick, this new, artificially pocked brick. The public buildings—the Capitol, the Governor's Palace, the Public Gaol, the Raleigh Tavern, the old courthouse—are in themselves intensely interesting; and Mrs. Rockefeller's fine collection of American folk art, on view in the Ludwell-Paradise house, is worth the trip to Williamsburg. The restoration of the public buildings would have been enough, for my taste. I understand that Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., encountered a good deal of resistance as it persisted in its typically American project of doing too much of a good thing, and I shared the feeling of many Virginians that this carpet-bagger Rockefeller had gone too far with this Reconstruction.

Virginia is solid for Britain; and during Garden Week it teemed with nobility and royalty, come to lend glamor for the benefit of Bundles for Britain. Lord Halifax was due in Charlottesville, where the presence of Th. Jefferson is almost palpable. A queer confrontation. But Jefferson was so far ahead of his time that Halifax, not Jefferson, is the ghost of the past. I'm told that some people at the University of Virginia still call its founder and designer "Mr." Jefferson, and his energy and ideas—so many, many ideas, inventions, plans carefully drawn on an architect's table of his own design—meet one at every turn.

The editorial pastures of the *Virginia Quarterly Review* and the building, designed by Jefferson, which houses it made me envious. . . . If you collect howlers you'll like the report of the Virginia student that Keats said that "Beauty is truth" and vice versa.

MARGARET MARSHALL

The National Gallery

ONE is tempted to open a description of the new museum in Washington with an itemized price list of its paintings. That would seem a simple and direct way of emphasizing the contrast between the spirit of the collection—which is preponderantly Renaissance and should be viewed in its correct historical perspective—and our own times. It would also bring to mind comparisons between the Medici and twentieth-century merchant princes, between the role of art in the quattro-cinque-cento and in the world today. The ramifications are numerous. They relate Uccello and Picasso, Dante and T. S. Eliot, Columbus and Freud, and they are based on the difference between an expanding world and a contracting one, or between man's successful struggle to dominate nature and his failure to dominate himself. The transition through the centuries from belief to skepticism includes war, revolution, and the invention of the machine; it is also marked by the consistent decline of human values (man's loss of a sense of personal identity) and the rise in value of the *thing*.

In just this connection it may be observed that Mr. Mellon's by-laws for the National Gallery make no provision for the inclusion of living art. Contemporary society, with its emphasis on use, has created no function for the spirit; con-

sequently its products best command a market value in terms of the past, in which it still served some function. The difference between Botticelli employed as a talent by the Medicis and Botticelli acquired as an investment by Mr. Mellon is the difference between two systems: one concerned itself with man's origin and his relationship to the universe, while the other is preoccupied with man's survival and his relationship to his immediate environment. The spiritual expression of the former is quite logically converted into the materialistic equivalents of the latter; dead art becomes a live commodity. According to twentieth-century rates of exchange, a Raphael is as good as a yacht. That is the judgment of an era which has reduced the purpose of its own artists to something between the madhouse and *kitsch*—or, in terms of profit and loss, to an economic risk. Mr. Mellon, for example, paid \$1,115,000 for the Alba Madonna, \$800,000 for the Niccolini Madonna, \$745,000 for St. George and the Dragon, \$838,000 for Botticelli's Adoration of the Magi, \$650,000 for Titian's Venus and the Mirror, and so on through a list which betrays something more than a simple love of beauty and the mystical experiences in life. We do not mean to suggest that Renaissance patronage was purely impersonal and idealistic in its motives, but it did exercise a creative and vital interest in the development of art; the interest, on the other hand, of our own Medicis is as posthumous as an inheritance tax.

The task of reviewing the collection, painting by painting, is almost impossible. It contains some six hundred pieces which are the joint gift of Mr. Mellon and Mr. Kress, ranging from the thirteenth century to the baroque and housed in a mock-Pantheon conceived by John Russell Pope. The exterior of the building itself is unimpressive, designed in a style which might be described as the Grant's Tomb American classical, a dismal attempt at architectural dignity accomplished by means of an opaque, windowless façade, squat proportions, and the sudden, unexpected height of an enormous cupola, crowning it all like a non-sequitur. The interior, although it is well lighted and well installed, communicates that same cold, mausoleum-like atmosphere, spreading through some fifty galleries, one opening interminably upon the other, until I had the feeling I was boring my way through solid pink marble. I mention the physical monotony of the place because it is characteristic of the museum as a whole. The collection lacks and requires variety. Both Mr. Mellon and Mr. Kress share an overwhelming and almost exclusive devotion to Italian art. (In fact, Mr. Kress's devotion has even been recognized by the Italian government to the extent of his elevation to the rank of a Knight of the Grand Cross of the Order of the Crown of Italy.)

There are startling omissions and even stranger inclusions. Often one finds the work of an entire school of disciples but no examples of the master; sometimes there are examples which are unauthentic or belong to an inferior, transitional period in the artist's career. We are offered the School of Orcagna but no Orcagna, the School of Piero della Francesca but no Francesca, Luini but no Leonardo da Vinci. Of the Lorenzetti brothers, the work of Ambrogio, which was the only important painting to come out of fifteenth-century Tuscany, is missing, although Pietro Lorenzetti, who succeeded in resisting the Renaissance, and a follower of Pietro

Lorenzetti are represented. The Germans muster a Dürer (even questioned in the catalogue) and two English Holbeins; there is no Schongauer, Grünewald, Wohlgemut, or Pleydenwurf. Van Eyck leads off the Flemish with a superb "Annunciation," although Rubens is only dubiously present in a portrait of "Isabella Brant" commonly attributed to Van Dyck, while Breughel, Bosch, and the important Flemish primitives are nowhere to be seen. There are nine Rembrandts to bolster up the Dutch, of which two only are really noteworthy, and a number of calendar-pieces by Hobbema to the exclusion of Ruysdael; one may also find a Nicolas Maes, whose chief virtue is his religious imitation of Rembrandt, but no Dirk Bouts, Goltzius, or Poelemburg. The French section is the real scandal of the exhibition; it contains an inconsequential Lancret and two Chardins and ignores almost in its entirety a painting tradition second in importance only to the Renaissance. The hiatus becomes all the more conspicuous in comparison with the plethora of Milanese, Siennese, Florentine, and Umbrian pupils, imitators, and journeymen. Giovanni del Biondo, Giovanni da Bologna, Giovanni da Milano, Giovanni di Niccolo da Pisa, Giampietrino, Tino di Camaino, Ambrogio de' Predis, Pietro da Montepulciano, to mention a few at random, but no Claude, Poussin, Fragonard, Watteau, Ingres, Courbet, or Delacroix. It should be remembered, too, that the collectors had unlimited resources at their disposal, that price, as they say, was no object. In fact, much the same sort of choice, care, and discrimination which would ordinarily be spent on compiling a valuable collection of stamps has gone into the selection of the pictures. We should like to add parenthetically for those who look upon this enormous museum as just a seed and germ of art that although it depends upon the government for support, its control remains perpetually in the hands of the Mellon family; so that no brash inconsistencies in policy or taste are likely to occur in the future. CHRISTOPHER LAZARE

A New Wave of Old Tyranny

THE WAVE OF THE PAST. By R. H. Markham. University of North Carolina Press. 25 cents. Cloth, \$1.

SIZE is not grandeur, as Thomas Huxley wrote, and success is not necessarily value. Mr. Markham's book of thirty-five pages is worth more than all the achievements of the German military machine—at least from the point of view of that morality which Christ, Buddha, and Confucius heralded and embodied. But we are bound to admit that cave men, too, have their ethics, which become manifest in bombs and flame-throwers, in the slaughter of women and children *ad maiorem Germaniae gloriam*. Admirers of success who are anxious not to miss a possible bandwagon may even call these ethics the "wave of the future."

Mr. Markham's views are different. He thinks the "new order" is neither new nor an order. As early as King David's time Absalom became "a sort of Führer or Duce." The Nazi order is no newer "than the temples of Luxor, Egypt" or the Pyramids at Giza, built by enslaving "millions for one man," as the Hungarian poet, Madach, expressed it. Little it matters that the Leviathan of Hobbes is substituted for the stony memorials preserving the embalmed Pharaohs. It would not

be easy to disprove that "the totalitarian state is the old tyrannical state made more destructive" or rather "a temporary resurgence of a black and bloody wave of the past."

Students of mankind's past are likely to indorse Mr. Markham's statement that "every bright page in history tells something of human liberation"; and that the wave of the future "in all the lands among all the peoples has been a movement toward more freedom." The story of our civilization, indeed, is the record of our gradual release from the tyranny of nature and the despotism of men. If mechanized cave men could be defeated with arguments, Markham's sermon on human history would become a powerful weapon. But the Nazis and their fellow-travelers understand only the language of machine-guns and the philosophy of depth charges.

However, those who jabber of the "wave of the future" pretend that war, crimes, and cruelties are but the scum on this wave; citing the French Revolution, they say that some good may come of all these undesirable happenings. To this Mr. Markham retorts that the French Revolution destroyed absolutism, whereas the new wave would restore it. I think we had better drop the comparison altogether, not merely because there was no Montesquieu, Rousseau, Diderot, or d'Alembert to usher in fascism, but also because it is doubtful whether the inconsistency of liberty and equality, the surge of nationalism as a heritage of the French Revolution, are, indeed, so valuable as to justify the hope that an eventual benefit may be derived from the ascendancy of cave men professing cave-man philosophy.

The arguments offered by the author certainly suffice to convince those who use their own brains and who are not utterly devoid of the moral principles common to civilized men. Mr. Markham's brilliant style admirably combines the good qualities of a missionary and a town crier. There is a story that someone hearing the chant of the latter in a German town—"the clock has struck midnight; beware ye all of fire and light"—remarked to his friend: "What sense has all this? Whoever is awake knows it is midnight, and those who are asleep do not hear him." "Yes," replied his friend, "but there are a good many who are drowsing." Persons who are inclined to nap may be aroused to danger by Mr. Markham's little masterpiece. RUSTEM VAMBERY

Holmes and Pollock

HOLMES-POLLOCK LETTERS: THE CORRESPONDENCE OF MR. JUSTICE HOLMES AND SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK, 1874-1932. Edited by Mark DeWolfe Howe. Harvard University Press. \$7.50.

THE major interest of Americans in these letters will naturally be evoked much more by those of Holmes than by those of Pollock. Yet Pollock was doubtless a necessary foil for Holmes's best. He was the more learned man of the two, but much the less vital. He could write about Arabian syntax; Holmes could not. But on the antiquities of common-law doctrine they were on a par. On constitutional law Pollock was sympathetic with Holmes, because in England what Parliament says goes, except as it can be diluted by interpretation when Parliament is slipshod or is uncertain about what it really wants.

Both men were aristocrats, in thought and in an insulation against what we are wont to call social sympathy. Their economic tenets let them dismiss socialism with almost a brief brandish of the pen. Holmes thought that anti-trust laws were foolish and mistaken. He wrote about flow of goods and seemed unaware of what economic power can do to those without it. Those who have wrongly claimed him as a radical will now have ample evidence to modify their meed of praise.

His great achievement as a Supreme Court justice came in part from his skepticism and his complete awareness that his preferences were *his* preferences and not of necessity dictates of nature or of the broad phrases of the Constitution. His greatest zest as a lawyer seemed to be for nice tracing of common-law doctrine back to its original font. And as a common-law judge he was unduly cautious about being creative. Changes were for the legislature, and when the legislature willed, judges must obey, unless some negative in the Constitution were clear and compelling.

All this, however, is a minor matter for the reader of these two rich volumes of a correspondence of nearly fifty years between two of the most learned and acute lawyers of a century and two scholars and thinkers who were equally at home in history, philosophy, and literature. On page after page there is good wine which needs no bush from a reviewer. Holmes is the more human and has the lighter touch. He relished frivolities which had little temptation for Pollock. Yet both swapped views on life's ultimates and the cosmos with a profundity worn so lightly that one wonders why the professional philosophers must so often be so wearisome and so reluctant to shoot directly at the target posed most plainly by the only questions which really press for answer.

Richness and breadth and depth have seldom if ever been borne more gaily. Some of the legal genealogizing of the earlier interchange may have but a limited appeal, but those who start skipping may miss gems that are not beyond their power to appraise. Holmes on the whole is as good as his talk, and those who have had the privilege of his talk cannot say more in tribute. Pollock is much better than any of his talk that has ever been reported. His shy averted face does not put its chains on his pen; and never did his learning or his decorum turn a valve against the bubbling that was Holmes.

Holmes writes little of his actual doings, outside of his engrossing job on the Supreme Court. He writes much of his reading and his thinking. It is something of a surprise that so much of his heavy reading was pursued from a sense of duty, usually in hopes of something more than he found. For his light reading he had great zest. He was dominantly interested in ideas, though skeptical about conclusions and ultimates, and his letters are filled with flashes of insight, as were his more formal essays and his talk. His thoughts often repeat themselves, but without getting stale. They are shots at the same target, but from different angles, or at different targets, from the same angle. Those on law and on philosophy will be in the main familiar to those who have read him elsewhere, though here they are often still more pungent, when prompted by a particular book or by something just at hand from Pollock. There is more that is new in the swift comments on literature and art. Good as these are, however, there may be a regret that the decorum that was Pollock and perhaps the

decorum that was Holmes robbed the letters of some of the famous one-line book reviews that sparkled in his talk.

Though Holmes wrote but little about the big constitutional controversies in which he gave his famous dissents, he wrote enough to emphasize the core of his conviction that it is not the function of a Supreme Court justice to try to play God. The contrast between his attitude and that of Chief Justice Taft as exposed in Taft's perhaps too revealing letters throws a bright light on the ineptitude that lay behind the demand for judicial reformation in 1937. Now that the reformation has come, it would be tempting to speculate where Holmes would stand in the new alignment. The safest answer would seem to be that he would not belong in any strong-willed determined camp. His make-up was far from that of a reforming enthusiast. He had zeal enough in his protests, but in constitutional matters it was the zeal of self-denial. In him were a depth and reach that were safeguards against too great eagerness for immediate special ends. He wrote that certitude is not the test of certainty. He was the thinker rather than the governor. His thinking still may govern after the governors are gone.

THOMAS REED POWELL

Irvin Cobb's World

EXIT LAUGHING. By Irvin S. Cobb. The Bobbs-Merrill Company. \$3.50.

IRVIN S. COBB has written a rambling, loose-jointed autobiography set in a world that ended sometime during the 1920's. Up to that time Cobb, who omits the exact date of his birth but admits it happened in Paducah, Kentucky, "two days before Custer and his men were wiped out," found life exciting, amusing, and profitable. But the times changed, and Irvin Cobb didn't. His reactions to such modernisms as income taxes, government regulation of industry, and social legislation strike the only sour note in a book that is in the main nostalgic and mellow. It reveals the author as a kindly, modest, well-meaning, "folksy" fellow; a defender of decency in life, letters, and politics. Missing entirely are the vituperations he poured upon President Roosevelt and the New Deal when he spoke over the radio during the 1940 Presidential campaign. But, then, Cobb is too skilful a writer to spoil his effects. His aim is to titillate and please the reader. In this he is successful.

A handy man with an adjective, possessing a sure touch for the bizarre, he is always a first-class journalist and storyteller. During his long career as reporter, war correspondent during the First World War, creator of the Judge Priest stories, lecturer, after-dinner speaker, scenarist, actor, and radio performer he met and knew the great and near-great. There are stories about Pulitzer and Chapin of the *World*, Woodrow Wilson, Calvin Coolidge, Theodore Roosevelt, William Travers Jerome, and many others. There are anecdotes about his boyhood days in the South, his World War adventures, his experiences as a Chautauqua lecturer, and his impressions of Hollywood. In fact, the book gives a one-sided but fascinating picture of life in America from 1900 until about 1928. "Exit Laughing" is swift, easy, harmless entertainment.

GEORGE JOEL

ART

Architecture of the TVA

QUITE plainly there is something unusually heartening and bracing about the architecture of the TVA, with its huge program of eleven dams and associated power plants, navigation locks, fertilizer plants and other industries, its fish hatcheries, its highways through recreational parks, its reforestation showing as pattern on the ground, its erosion-control projects, rural electric lines, defense plants, and new communities. Writers try to deal with the Tennessee Valley like Whitman. Younger architects report an experience not unlike getting religion. The director of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, in the course of opening the current show, said bluntly that the architecture of the TVA was "the greatest that America had yet produced."

The show itself is built around the magnificent photographs for which the Authority is noted, and which translate the homogeneity of the endeavor with a fine consistency of their own.

What is there about a building project such as that of the TVA that puts it so entirely apart from other large correlated ventures such as Rockefeller Center? The difference lies in the sense of something big being done for literally everybody, of unbounded power used with unreserved magnanimity.

Even in technical terms, the problem set in the Tennessee Valley had an unprecedented scope, complexity, and grandeur of scale, and the designers knew it. Of architecture as an art it used to be said that it dealt with the inclosure of space. That was when the primary concern was with individual buildings. Then projects of a higher class were conceived—involving a consistent character for whole city areas or royal estates, as in the squares of Bloomsbury, the boulevards of Haussmann, the gardens of Versailles. In the Valley, however, architecture has taken hold of an area of 40,000 square miles, inhabited by 2,000,000 people, based on 650 miles of the all-important river.

Really to get hold of the idea, it is necessary to be quite strict in thinking of the whole Valley as the unit that was reshaped. The dams are merely the climaxes. The wooded areas and more level farms are an element that it was not necessary to touch. Nevertheless, they played their assigned parts in a grand theme first-announced through the contour plowing of sloping hillsides, and then carried with ever-increasing complexity into the industrial culmination.

Before going into the handsome way in which this larger theme was knit, it may be well to speak of the most obvious part, the dams, locks, and power houses. The grand scale was not frittered away. The usual American dam is a giant with Lilliputian scholars and clowns posturing all over his back in togas or cap and bells. The ruggedness at TVA, the blocky big simplicity that is found even in auxiliary structures such as, for example, the control house at Gunthersville, may seem to casual visitors to be a natural consequence or purely "functional." This is not so. It is carefully evoked, a matter of design having to do with proportion, craftsmanship with materials, placing, scale, and a sense of the drama in the whole thing. Consider, if you will, the tall dam at Norris with the power house at its foot. The stately curved profile of the dam itself is the result of pure engineering calculation; but the way in which the power house below has been juxtaposed as a compact cube, off-center, and the way its openings have been cut in the geometrically patterned surface, even the way the roof has been covered with concrete slabs chiefly for the appearance from above, all are architecture in its oldest and most basic sense.

Much could be written on the cunning correlations made all up and down the line, and the more serious reader is

referred to *Architectural Forum* for August and *Pencil Points* for November, both 1939. These magazines, along with the exhibit at the Modern Museum, give some notion of what was produced in the way of a new index of current American design, in which the controlling thought was to hold to the larger purposes, to be neither clumsy nor overclever, to do generously the job at hand and then quit.

What remains to be done here is to insist on the larger view of architecture itself that TVA has generated. A glimpse of this larger formative pattern might be found in the cunning that quarried the stone so as to leave behind parking slips for pleasure boats after the water had risen. The same thought could be found in the design of roads as a new kind of "freeway" assuring both more rapid deliveries for farmers and a greater enjoyment of the landscape for the visitor on vacation. It could be found in the multiple-minded fashion in which means were shaped to several sets of ends and the entire area so homogeneously treated that there could be no reason for confining the term "architecture" to the one part where the materials used happened to be concrete and steel instead of soil, trees, water surfaces, or rock. Here all elements conveyed the same theme—of nature tended and controlled so as to yield nourishment, power, and enjoyment all together.

It's as if Joshua had fit a new battle of Jericho and the walls had come tumblin' down. In the forward view that is opened at TVA the walls, even the big ones, have dropped to a minor role. The glimpse that is given is of man working upon the *whole* of his environment to put it into habitable, workable, agreeable, and friendly shape. As a concept, architecture can today be no less.

The spirit manifest in TVA shows that the designers were aware of such an aim and sought for architectural expression that would make it speak. There is something still further that seems important in the Valley. Here the complexity of the planning put the American people to a severe test, and they came out of it with colors flying, with a *collaborative* venture. Not only did the architects collaborate with the engineers, and both with the farmers, and so on, but nobody had his name put on a commemorative tablet. All the inscriptions give only the date and the motto, "Built for the People of the United States." It could have been added, "—and by Them." In this collaborative effort the people of America

**INSIDE
AMERICA**

**Short, Inexpensive
Summer Field Trips**

Get acquainted with the workings of the T.V.A., with the life of Rocky Mountain ranches and mining camps, with the Indians and Spanish Americans of the Southwest, with problems and progress in the deep South, with the forces at work in industrial communities of the East.

Meet plantation owners and sharecroppers, mine operators and miners, hill-billies and factory workers, Rotarians, labor leaders, fundamentalist preachers, government experts, country editors, Negro leaders and crossroad politicians. Visit them in their homes, churches, clubs and on their jobs. Learn from them how we Americans live and work together.

THE OPEN ROAD

12th Floor
8 West 40th St., New York

showed themselves so much more than the equals of any loudmouth for some superimposed "new" order that their doubts ought to dissolve away.

Mayor LaGuardia told, with great effect, how close we came at the start to thinking it was "too big" for us and "giving it all away." The thought that a people might turn nerveless now that a TVA has been built, and proceed to give over, is enough to make one sick.

DOUGLAS HASKELL

RECORDS

BACH'S own translations of his works from the terms of one medium into those of another are cited as justifying the work of modern transcribers: he made clavier concertos out of violin concertos, a movement of a concerto into a choral movement of a church cantata. But the important thing about all this is that each different form of a work—even when thought out somewhat differently in the different terms of the different medium—is recognizably, unmistakably the expression of the same mind, personality, feeling; and this undoubtedly would be so if Bach were himself to transcribe one of his organ works for present-day orchestra. What his own transcriptions of his works demonstrate, in other words, is that a composer's instrumentation is no less an integral part of his artistic thought than a painter's color, and his way of scoring no less an expression of his way of feeling than is his way of writing melody and counterpoint. Even a Schönberg, then, applying orchestral color to the lines of Bach's texture with precision and subtlety that express his fastidiousness of mind and taste, imparts to the music an emotional quality that is not Bach's. The others—Stokowski, Respighi, Elgar, and the rest—remind me of what a musician I know said of Strauss: "Debussy is like a painter who looks at his canvas and asks himself what more he can take out; Strauss is like a painter who has covered every inch with paint and when there isn't another inch to cover takes the paint he has left and throws it at the canvas"; and they inject into Bach their own crude vulgarities and excitements. In Columbia's Set X-195 (\$2.50), it is the uncomprehending vulgarity of Weiner, who orchestrated the Toccata, Adagio and Fugue in C for organ, and the equally uncomprehending sensationalism of Mitropoulos, who performs this version with his Minneapolis Symphony.

The recording is clear and brilliant, with occasional rattles; and my set has one unusually noisy surface.

Then there are Stokowski's "syntheses" of Wagner—an impressive name for the monstrous procedure of tearing passages out of Wagner's original order and context and piecing them together in an order of Stokowski's contriving. Two years ago he recorded a "Tristan und Isolde: Prelude-Liebesnacht-Liebestod" which spliced together passages from Acts 2 and 3 and ended with the catastrophic conclusion of Act 2 instead of with what was described as "the conventional ending." Now he has recorded—this time with the American Youth Orchestra for Columbia (Set 427, \$3.50)—what he calls "Love Music from Tristan und Isolde": the second-act duet beginning with "O sink hernieder," in which one is astonished to hear suddenly a few measures from Tristan's delirium in the third act, which in turn lead to "So stürben wir" of the second act, which eventually is spliced to the "conventional ending" of the opera. Years ago, when he recorded his first orchestral version of the second-act music, I pointed out that Wagner had used the color of the human voice with as much design and precision in this music as he had the colors of instruments, and that the music lost disastrously by the substitution of instruments for the voices; but in the present instance the strands of the texture are not even clearly defined in the murky fog of heaving, billowing sound without structural outline that comes off the first two records. There is clearer and sumptuous sound from the last record; but the style of performance remains the same—remains, that is, with its breaking up of every continuous line of phrase into discontinuous expansions and contractions of lush sonority, the final violation of the integrity and character of Wagner's music. The recording is also afflicted with bad rattles.

It is a relief and pleasure to turn from all this to the beautiful clarity and balance and refinement of the recorded sound, the imaginative power and musical taste and technical finish of the performance, in Columbia's set of Tchaikovsky's "Francesca da Rimini," made in England by Beecham and the London Philharmonic (Set 447, \$3.50). The work is superb in substance, but diffuse and repetitious in form. And on a single disc (71049-D, \$1) are three dances from Smetana's "Bartered Bride," played with verve by the Columbia Broadcasting Symphony under Barlow,

and recorded with brash, reverberant brilliance.

Prokofiev's String Quartet Op. 50 is arid stuff, well performed by the Stuyvesant Quartet, and well recorded except for slight sharpness (Set 448, \$3.50). And Ravel's "Valses Nobles et Sentimentales" are his usual slick trash, well played by Casadesus, and clearly recorded (Set X-194, \$2).

That leaves a single disc (71048-D, \$1) with Leporello's "Madamina, il catalogo è questo" and "Ah, pietà! Signori miei." The mischief and wit that Mozart put into the orchestra behind "Madamina" can be heard in the orchestra conducted by Leinsdorf, but only faintly behind the sonorous singing of Baccaloni.

To its valuable Add-A-Part recordings, which enable one to participate in performances of chamber music, Columbia has added its Student Music Library series, for which I think it claims a little too much. Someone playing the piano by himself and struggling with the particular pieces recorded by Sergius Kagen (Sets E-1 and E-2, \$2 each) will find it helpful to have these recorded performances to turn to for an idea of the ordered and significant forms that are to be achieved out of the clutter of notes and beats and rests. But someone studying with a teacher gets this idea from his teacher; and while the teacher will want him to listen to what shape and significance a great artist gives to a piece of music, the work in such a case will be not a beginner's piece by Beethoven but one of the great sonatas or concertos, and the performer not Mr. Kagen but Schnabel. So with the volumes of violin music recorded by Alexander Cores (Set E-3) and 'cello music recorded by Bernard Greenhouse (Set E-4); and I would question the choice of music in the 'cello volume.

B. H. HAGGIN

LILY PONS

Only New York Concert
This Season

Selections from Handel, Liszt, Debussy,
Bishop, Faure, Hue, Alabieff, Poldini,
Rossini and others (*Baldwin Piano*)

In addition **LIN YUTANG** will speak
Arranged by China Aid Council
for United China Relief Fund

CARNEGIE HALL, MAY 20th

8:30 P.M.

Tickets—\$1, \$1.50, \$2, \$2.50, \$3, at:
Carnegie Hall Box Office. Circle 7-7460
United China Relief, 1790 B'way at 58th St.
China Aid Council, 200 5th Ave., at 23d St., AL 4-3162

Letters to the Editors

Unfair Attacks on Wages

Dear Sirs: The sense of fair play of the American public is being unfairly exploited by certain employer spokesmen in what seems to be an attempt to reduce the percentage of national income that labor will receive during the war boom.

One line of attack assumes that if prices are to be frozen, it would be only fair to freeze wages also, by government action. It implies that this would be equal treatment for labor and capital. Actually, as war orders increase the volume of sales, percentage profits will greatly increase even if the sale price of individual items remains constant. And while profits thus soar, the wage-earner with frozen wage will have no such multiplication of his income.

Another widely broadcast attack upon high wages, this time with patriotic appeal, assumes that fair play should prevent workers from receiving high wages in safe jobs back home while the drafted men are getting ready to risk their lives on a mere pittance. It would seem more logical for the draftee to say, "I am giving up all chance of good wages to serve my country in defense of American democracy and living standards. In compensation, my country should let my father and brothers back home have higher wages than ever to protect my family and our wage standards while I am away."

PEVERIL MEIGS

Chico, Cal., April 27

Negroes in Defense

Dear Sirs: No fair-minded man can object to Jonathan Daniels's complaint published in your issue of April 26 that the South is not getting its fair share of defense contracts. But the same complaint applies with even greater force to the utter failure of defense industries to provide jobs for Negroes in anything approaching their proportion of the total population. In one vitally important line of defense production, aircraft manufacturing, the companies absolutely refuse to hire Negroes. As a result of this discrimination, joblessness persists in Negro communities just as before the defense program started, and the country is deprived of the use for defense purposes

of an important section of its labor force.

This situation has another terribly serious aspect. As a trade unionist I am fully aware that the life or death of organized labor on the continent of Europe depends on the outcome of the war. As a Negro I know that our struggle for genuine justice and full democratic rights irrespective of race, creed, or color will be set back a generation or more if Hitler, with his vile racial ideas of a master race and slave races, wins the war. But the failure of colored Americans to gain any jobs from the defense program has left them a prey to the propaganda of supporters of totalitarianism of all kinds—Nazism, communism, anti-Semitism.

It should be plain that the defense of democracy must be in the hands of those who truly believe in and live up to democracy. Those who practice or lightly ignore race discrimination are not genuine believers in democracy. The continued presence of such people in high government positions—Mr. Knudsen, for example, who refused to see a delegation of representative Negroes protesting against job discrimination—affords a basis for the propaganda of fifth columnists among Negroes.

FRANK R. CROSSWAITH,

Editor, Negro Labor News Service
New York, May 5

Sandburg and Halifax

Dear Sirs: Lord Halifax on a Horse, Carl Sandburg's article in *The Nation* of April 26, would please Hitler, for it ridicules English aristocracy. As for Mr. Sandburg's scorn of English fox-hunting—a sport which, incidentally, is not in England confined to aristocrats—in the days of Andrew Jackson this attitude might have been considered red-blooded Americanism, but now such petty provincialism is generally left to demagogic politicians.

Mr. Sandburg also seems to object to Lord Halifax's traveling in a private car. This, however, is often done by Americans without unfavorable comment. Finally, he suggests that in America Lord Halifax should not ride a horse in a fox hunt because in Europe some people lack horse meat.

Why all this animus? Is it because

Lord Halifax was born an aristocrat? Or—since Mr. Sandburg notes that he is an Anglican—is it because throughout a very busy life he has attended religious services before breakfast every day in the week? Perhaps some cannot forgive either aristocracy or piety.

The Nation fights valiantly against Hitler. It is a pity to aid him, even remotely, by awakening old prejudices.

FRED R. BRYSON

Little Rock, Ark., May 3

Dear Sirs: Carl Sandburg suggests that Lord Halifax and his fox-hunting antics in the United States were "merely indicative of a fraction of the British embassy which lives in the past and hopes the future will be the same." Blotched leaf after blotched leaf of the record of the British government since 1931 lends some credence to the suggestion that perhaps Lord Halifax, with his values and interpretations, constitutes more than a small fraction of the British embassy and its home government. To permit a license, a great deal is to be said for the proposition that it is an improper fraction—altogether improper in view of the increasingly "all-out" position being taken by the American people and government.

It may come to pass that a considerable part of the population of Great Britain will see that there was logic in the dispatch of Halifax to the United States, Hoare to Madrid; that the forces behind the "renounced" policy of appeasement linger on. If this should come to be the prevailing opinion, something may happen to shock both Lord Halifax and Mr. Sandburg. It is not at all inconceivable that Lord Halifax and his horse and all they represent may be torn apart and eaten.

MARTYN C. CLAPP

Chicago, Ill., May 4

Deferment and Strikes

Dear Sirs: Donald Olson, an employee of the Hanson Whitney Machine Company at Hartford, Connecticut, received draft preferment because he was engaged in defense production. When he and other employees of the company went on strike, the local draft boards declared him eligible for service. If this ruling is upheld, it may act as perpetual

K I N N A C A M P S 15th Year

Milton, Vermont

On Beautiful Lake Champlain
Remedial for Hay Fever and Asthma

Girls 5 to 18

Individual Programs AKIN to the Needs and Temperament of Each Camper

Ideal for new campers seeking first year adjustment and those girls who are tired of the monotony of old style camping, crave adventure, leadership and self-expression. A sensibly progressive and creative camp avoiding extremes and located on a safe, sandy beach. All land, water sports, sailing, canoeing, aquaplaning. Horseback riding, optional overnight hikes into Green Mountains, Smuggler's Notch, Ausable Chasm, trips to Canada.

Town Meeting Democracy and Self-Government Taught Under Expert Guidance. No Overstimulation. No Regimentation. No Uniform. Emphasis on Cooperative Living Rather Than Competition. Telephone or write Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Rosenfield, Owners and Directors, 43-15 46th Street, Sunnyside, L. I. Tel. Stillwell 4-7380.

PIONEER YOUTH CAMP

Rifton, New York 18th SUMMER
Walter Ludwig, Dir. Progressive Camping

* BOYS, GIRLS, 6-15 YEARS SMALL AGE GROUPS

Mature division heads and counselors.
All Sports, Folk Dancing, Dramatics, Painting, Wood-working. Creative use of historic Hudson Valley region.

Non-Sectarian Non-Profit-Making

Nine Weeks, \$150 Shorter periods

Few scholarship rates available on application

Send for folder to:

Mrs. Frima Frumes, Camp Registrar

PIONEER YOUTH OF AMERICA, INC.

219 W. 29th St., New York City PE 6-3054

* WORK CAMP FOR 15 TO 17 YR. BOYS & GIRLS

SPECIAL RATES

ADULT CAMPS

There is something new in camps. Spacious, charming, magnificent, yet simplicity prevails

CAMP COLEBROOK

Colebrook River Connecticut

DIANA & ABE BERMAN

formerly of Uncas Lodge, are proud to announce their new location, in the center of the Berkshires, altitude 1500 feet, formerly an exclusive country club.

- Beautiful mountain lake, surrounded by 320 acres of pines, hemlocks, poplars, etc.
- Artistic lodges facing lake, beautifully landscaped, each with fieldstone fireplace.
- Excellent clay tennis courts and new cement handball courts.
- Ping-pong, croquet green, archery, baseball field.
- Orchestra and social activities.

Decoration Day Weekend: \$12-3 full days
Phone: ALgonquin 4-0063

CAMP THREE ARROWS

"Where Nature Is Still Unspoiled"

All Outdoor Sports—Wholesome Food

Decoration Week-End Special \$8.00—3 Days

SHRUB OAK • NEW YORK

N. Y. Office—25 Warren St. BArlay 7-7127

DECORATION DAY WEEK-END TAMIMENT

PENNA.

GALA SPRING PARTY

Thurs., May 29th to Sun., June 1st

Help us inaugurate our new Social Hall. Get the first view of our perfectly equipped modern Playhouse.

For rates and routes inquire:

N. Y. HEADQUARTERS: 7 East 15th Street
(near Fifth Avenue)
Phone ALgonquin 4-3441

LECTURE

THE GROUP FORUM

Meets at Hotel Peter Stuyvesant—2 West 86th St.
Tues. Eve., MAY 20, at 8:45 P. M.

Struthers Burt and George Dethuit

will speak on

"CAN AMERICAN FREEDOM SURVIVE
IN A HITLERIZED WORLD?"

Camp CHI-WAN-DA

FOR BOYS and GIRLS
ULSTER PARK, N.Y.
On the Mountain Lake
Esopus overlooking the
Beautiful Hudson River

We present a modern cultural environment for your children. All cabins with latest improvements. Reasonable rates. For full information, write or call for booklet. JACOB I. DOROSHKIN, Director
545 5th Ave. MU. 2-4218—DI. 6-8055

ALYSSUM

"Day Camp for Boys and Girls"
SOMETHING ENTIRELY NEW IN ACCOMMODATION FOR PARENTS AND CHILDREN

A luxurious hotel combined with a modern camp for boys & girls 3-12. Cultural-Occupational work. Write for particulars: Box 7, Armonk, New York

WESTERN VIEW FARM

NOW OPEN

TED OHMER—NEW MILFORD, CONN.

BOOK



"If you really want to save your hair, this book tells you exactly how to go about it. Contains a wealth of strictly reliable scientific information about the care of the hair, including what to do about dandruff." Illustrated by OSCAR L. LEVIN, M.D. Formerly \$2—NOW 98¢ Money back if not satisfied.

EMERSON BOOKS, Dept. 516-B, 251 W. 19 St., N. Y. C.

SHOW AND DANCE

SOCIAL WORKERS HOBBY SHOW & DANCE. Sat. Eve. May 17, Manhattan Center, 34th St., and 8th Ave. Exciting hobbies exhibited by 75 prominent social workers. Dancing to music by Ralph Hayes. Auspices: SOCIAL WORK TODAY, 112 East 19th St., N. Y. C. Admission: \$1.00.

LANGUAGES

Bargain Phonograph Courses. All Makes. Mail Orders. Booklet N. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 E. 41st St., N. Y. C.

SUBLET

Desirable. Sunny five-room elevator apartment. Completely furnished. Linens, dishes, silver, radio. 160 West 87th St. SC 4-8406.

FOR SALE OR RENT

DO YOU SEEK SECLUSION? See gentleman's estate, Northport, L. I. Intriguing, rustic 6-room cabin; fully equipped; on wooded elevation. Rural and Sound views. Near everything. Sell with 4 to 40 acres, or rent. Box 1323, c/o The Nation.

PASSENGERS WANTED

Young man traveling automobile Mexico or Canada July 1, month's vacation, desires 2 passengers, share expenses. Box 1317, c/o The Nation.



"SHOW
PLACE
of the
Vacation
World"

Camp Facilities - Hotel Comforts

Unexcelled Cuisine
Special Entertainment Features
All Land and Water Sports

RATES: Weekly, \$28. June, \$25.

De Luxe slightly higher

(Lower to Union Members)

Write for information and
Illustrated Booklet to

UNITY HOUSE, FOREST PARK PENNA.

New York Office: 3 West 16th Street

Telephone: WAtkins 9-6868

Owned and operated by
I. L. G. W. U. on non-profit basis.
Alfred A. Tazin, Manager

Make Reservations NOW!

SUMMER RENTALS

An Inexpensive Vacation for the Entire Family!

Newly furnished Bungalows on sturdy structures, beautifully landscaped. Kitchenette facilities. Lake on premises, Tennis, Handball, Rowing, Canoeing, Fishing, Bathing, Horseback Riding, etc. Write or phone for Booklet.

Somerset Bungalow Colony

* FORMERLY CAMP CARLSLE *
SYLVAN LAKE • HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N.Y.
N.Y. OFFICE • 261 BROADWAY • REdv 2-4319

BUNGALOW COLONY

Camp Life for Entire Family

Housekeeping, furnished, modern conveniences, including frigidaires. Counsellors for children. Arts and Crafts. All athletic activities. Private lake, etc. New York City, 86 miles. Philadelphia, 35 miles. Price very reasonable. Write for particulars.
V. J. Sharpe, 402 75th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Brookridge Cottages. Delightful, modern; fireplaces, all improvements; tennis, bathing, badminton, secluded country, commuting distance. Peekskill 3515 M 2.

Westport, Conn. 20 minutes from beach. Colonial farm house, 7 rooms, 2 baths. \$600, long season. Phone Dr. Leslie, ME 3-2380.

Bungalows, all conveniences, athletic facilities, \$250-400 season. Tel. Peekskill 2957W or UN 3-4150. Also acreage for sale.

Bungalows—Spring Glen, N. Y. Modern 2-3-4 rooms; moderate rentals; sports facilities; bathing. Ideal for families and groups. For particulars write or call: Lapidus & Spitzer, 270 Rugby Rd., B'klyn, N. Y. BU 2-4925.

Charming cottage, Cold Spring, N. Y. Suitable for small family. All modern improvements. Swimming. Secluded. Garden. 55 miles Manhattan. Very reasonable. Phone weekdays MO 2-3965.

Cottages, small congenial colony, 156 beautiful acres. Swimming, fishing, tennis. Kingsbridge 6-0988. Mornings to 12—Evenings to 9.

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

coercion on the workers in any plant. However much one may regret strikes in defense industries, the facts have often proved them justified. Certainly it should not be in the power of a draft board to interfere, directly or indirectly, with the right of labor to strike.

The regulation permitting deferment to a person engaged in a defense industry, if it is to be interpreted in this way, may prove to be a Damoclean sword over the head of organized labor, and might better be abolished. If it is continued, the national draft board should promulgate a ruling to the effect that no worker deferred because of his employment in defense shall lose that deferment merely because he joins his fellow-workers in a strike.

LINCOLN LAUTERSTEIN
Cambridge, Mass., May 2

C.D.A.A.A., Jr.

Dear Sirs: In recent years the more prominent leaders of the youth organizations of this nation have prostituted their programs and members to a defense of the foreign policy of the U. S. S. R. As a result, American youth as a whole has come in for a great deal of unwarranted criticism. Some accuse us of being wholly divorced from any belief in democracy or trust in the American way of life. We are viewed contemptuously by many as skeptics drifting without a compass. Yet in spite of some false leaders, youth has still an unqualified faith in the promise of America.

There are, I admit, many reasons why youth should be critical of some of the aspects of our system. We have the right and the duty to point to the shortcomings of a political democracy which refuses to recognize the need for economic democracy. However, only by battling for the major tenets and basic axioms of a free society can we hope to arrive at a time when we can abolish the inequalities in America. This is a time for positive democracy. American young people should recognize their responsibilities.

When peace comes, American youth must demand (1) that no vindictive peace be written; (2) that some new form of world organization more effective than the League of Nations be created; (3) that America play a leading role in this new state and be not duped by isolationists into retreating once more from the battle for a New World Order based on the triumph of reason and justice.

In the minds of those whom I represent, the only assurance of the continuance of liberalism as a force in world politics is a victory of Great Britain and its allies. The least American youth can do is to present to the aggressors a united front of an aroused but critical student youth ready to defend a theory of government which gives it the right to be critical. Unless we are willing to battle the forces which would deny us this right, we shall lose the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity. Let us guard the right to be critical! Let us help those who are fighting for that right!

For the purpose of clearing youth's name of the stigma cast upon it by false representatives and to solidify the opinion of high-school students behind America's policy of all-out aid to Britain, the Committee to Defend Democracy has been organized as a junior division of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. Briefly, our program is this: (1) to oppose isolationism in all its manifestations; (2) to encourage people of foreign ancestry whose home lands have been overrun to support the exile governments of these nations; (3) to work for a just and lasting peace after the defeat of the aggressors. A complete statement of this policy will be sent to all who request it.

We would welcome the formation of associate committees in any part of the country. Anyone interested in our movement is urged to write to the Defend Democracy Committee, 516 Davis Street, Evanston, Illinois.

WILLIAM YOUNG,
Vice-Chairman
Evanston, Ill., May 6

India Is Calling

Dear Sirs: India is calling for help. Not audibly and not officially because that it cannot do. Nevertheless, the long-suffering Indian people are calling to our consciences.

Civil disobedience is on again. Jawaharlal Nehru has been imprisoned since the fall of 1940. Soon all British-Indian jails will again be filled to overflowing. How does it all agree with the slogan "We fight for freedom and democracy"?

Britain needs America's help and should get it, but it is our privilege and our duty to use the tool which Providence has placed in our hands. We should demand a solemn promise from the English to grant freedom to the Indian people when their own battle for "freedom" is over.

Exploitation of peoples or countries belongs neither to the progressive spirit of the twentieth century nor, I hope, to the coming democratic world order. It is in its way just as evil as fascism or dictatorship. Our great sympathy and respect for the British people should not dull our deeply felt compassion for our Indian friends. We are indeed our brother's keeper; let us not forget it even in this tense hour.

ERICA KARAWINA-HSIAO
Cambridge, Mass., May 6

CONTRIBUTORS

LOUIS FISCHER, for many years *The Nation's* Moscow correspondent, has just published his autobiography under the title of "Men and Politics."

BRYANT PUTNEY is a staff writer for Editorial Research Reports, a Washington newspaper service.

WILLIAM ZUKERMAN, for many years the European correspondent of the New York Jewish *Morning Journal*, is the author of "The Jew in Revolt."

ALFRED VAGTS, author of "A History of Militarism," is connected with the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University.

JUSTIN O'BRIEN is assistant professor of French at Columbia University and author of "The Novel of Adolescence in France."

CHRISTOPHER LAZARE, formerly art editor of the *North American Review*, is now assistant editor of *Decision*.

RUSTEM VAMBERY, Hungarian criminologist and sociologist, has written extensively on European political problems.

THOMAS REED POWELL is Story professor of law at the Harvard University Law School.

GEORGE JOEL is on the staff of the Dial Press.

DOUGLAS HASKELL, formerly on the editorial staff of the *Architectural Record*, has written regularly for *The Nation* on housing and architecture.

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year \$5; Two years \$8; Three years \$11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, \$1; Canadian, \$1. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Index to Labor Articles, Public Affairs Information Service, Dramatic Index. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.